

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. X.

JULY, 1906.

No. 3.

THE MISSOURI SYNOD AND DIETRICH'S CATECHISM.

The late Intersynodical Conference which was convened at Fort Wayne during August, 1905, had met for the stated purpose of examining the proof-texts of Scripture bearing on the doctrine of election. As frequently happens during discussions of this nature, matters not really essential to the business in hand were touched upon by the speakers. Thus the Fort Wayne Convention was advised that the Missouri Synod had adopted a new catechism for use in its churches and schools in lieu of Conrad Dietrich's Catechism, formerly the authorized catechism of the Missouri Synod; and that this action was tantamount to a repudiation of Missouri's former teaching on the subject of election, inasmuch as Dietrich's Catechism taught the doctrine which the Missouri Synod at present rejects. We quote the information as it was communicated to the public through church papers at the time.

Dietrich's Catechism was referred to in order to prove that the opponents of Missouri stand where this Synod (Missouri) stood formerly. Dietrich's edition of Luther's Smaller Catechism was for years published by the Missouri Synod and used in its churches. This catechism teaches on election: The grounds for election are threefold, to-wit: 1. the unfathomable goodness and mercy of God; 2. the unlimited atonement proclaimed in the Gospel; 3. the abiding saving faith in Christ. This catechism has for some years been replaced by another edition which, it is claimed, is in greater harmony with the present teaching of the Synod.

(Dr. Nicum in report to *The Lutheran* of August 31, 1905, regarding the Intersynodical Conference held at Fort Wayne, Ind., Aug. 8—10.)

The latter (the Joint Synod of Ohio, and the German Synod of Iowa, and some others) undoubtedly made a strong point against Missouri by showing that Dietrich's Catechism (that is, his edition of Luther's Small Catechism), which had been used in the churches of the Missouri Synod for many years, really occupied the position maintained by Ohio and Iowa, and that "this catechism has for years been replaced by another edition which, it is claimed, is in greater harmony with the present position of the Missouri Synod."

One would suppose that if it can be shown, from their own publications, that the Missouri theologians formerly taught what they do not teach now, there is some reason to hope that they may see the error of their way, and return to their former position, which, as their opponents claim, is that which has been and is held by the great majority of Lutheran theologians, as in accordance with the Scriptures and the Confessions of the Church.

(Editorial in *The Lutheran* of August 31, 1905.)

Now, as before stated, the question here raised was really foreign to the express purpose for which the Conference had met. For supposing that the claim of Missouri's opponents was correct, what would the opponents gain by it, so long as the acknowledged proof-texts of Scripture bear out Missouri in the pending controversy? The claim of the opponents necessarily implies that Missouri had discovered that Dietrich's Catechism was not in agreement with what Missouri considered Scriptural teaching on the subject of election. Let us assume that Missourians were mistaken in their view of what Scripture really teaches on that subject, still, if they thought that they had discovered the true teaching of Scripture and at the same time discovered a disagreement between the teaching of Scripture and their catechism, it became their duty to either change their catechism so as to bring it into harmony with Scripture, or, if that proved impracticable, to abolish the catechism. The consistency of faith would have demanded such action peremptorily, and Missouri would have been dishonest, had she failed to take such action. If her hymns were found to contain sentiments contrary to Scripture, those hymns must be expurgated, or the entire hymnbook withdrawn. If her liturgies were proven to deviate from the teaching of Scripture,

the liturgies must be cashiered. All this would be sound practice, in accordance with God's Word, and entitling the Missouri Synod to the praise and commendation of all lovers of purity, *i. e.*, strict scripturalness, of doctrine. Hence, the fact of the change in itself does not prove the Missouri Synod heterodox; for she might have become strictly orthodox through just such a change. The point to be established against Missouri is this: Has this synod, by adopting a new catechism, departed from the teaching of Scripture? Before this question every other question pales into insignificance. It is desirable that this question remain the paramount issue, if the public discussion of doctrinal differences between the Missouri Synod and her opponents is to be continued. And it has been chiefly for this reason that comparatively little has been said on our part since the Fort Wayne Convention regarding the misleading reports, that Missouri had for doctrinal reasons exchanged Dietrich's Catechism for another: we would like to keep the discussion to the main point at issue. For our part, the discussion of this matter of the change of catechism might be postponed, in order that the discussion of Scripture may not be disturbed. It appears, however, that our opponents really believe, as the editor of *The Lutheran* has conditionally stated, that "a strong point was made" by the introduction of this matter. And as silence might be construed to mean consent, it becomes a duty to speak.

We were astonished to find that the report to which we have referred could gain acceptance. For two things must be quite plain to men like those who were discussing election at Fort Wayne: 1. that the report misrepresents Dietrich's Catechism; 2. that it misrepresents the Missouri Synod.

No matter what Conrad Dietrich may have taught in his other writings, or what *τρόπος παιδείας* he may have adopted in presenting the doctrine of election, in his Catechism he does not say or teach that man was elected in view of faith. The claim that Dietrich's Catechism posits three causes of election, and that faith is one of these causes, rests, in a merciful esti-

mate, on a very superficial acquaintance with the teachings of this famous catechism.

The first mention¹⁾ in this catechism of the subject of election occurs in Qu. 281:

Why is He called the Holy Ghost? Because He is the author of true holiness, and truly sanctifies all the elect.

It must be remembered that Dietrich is careful to distinguish between sanctification in the broad and in the narrow sense, between that sanctifying act by which the Holy Ghost leads men unto faith, works faith in them, grants them the power to believe, and between those sanctifying acts by which the Holy Ghost employs the faith already existent in men unto good works. In Qu. 281 he speaks of sanctification in the broad or wide sense; for his very next question reads:

What is meant by the sanctification of which the Third Article treats? It is properly that act of the Holy Spirit in which He calls us through the Gospel, enlightens us by His gifts, and sanctifies and preserves us in the true faith.

Eight questions further, after the doctrine of the call and the illumination of sinners have been treated (Qu. 290), Dietrich puts this question:

What is sanctifying, as used here in the narrow sense? It is the act of the Holy Spirit in which He sanctifies us through the Gospel in the true faith in Jesus Christ, and moves us to holy works which are pleasing to God.

Evidently, then, when Dietrich discusses the office of the Holy Ghost in general, before entering upon a detailed account of the various parts and functions of this office, and says: "The Holy Ghost truly sanctifies the elect," his meaning cannot be any other than that the Holy Ghost calls, gathers, enlightens, sanctifies, and preserves the elect. In Dietrich's view the elect whom the Holy Ghost sanctifies are not people who have already passed through the initial stages of the new life, have accepted the call of grace, and have been enlightened by grace, but people

1) "The elect" are first mentioned in Qu. 244 in connection with Christ's kingdom of glory.

for whom nothing at all of a spiritual nature has been done as yet. The Holy Ghost begins His operations upon them in their wicked natural state. He finds them, as He finds the rest of mankind, "dead in trespasses and sins," and "children of wrath." But He finds them also "the elect according to the foreknowledge of God," in spite of their trespasses and sins and their guilty state. And as He finds them, so He undertakes to sanctify them, from beginning to end. First He calls them. How does Dietrich view this act? Qu. 288 he says:

What is the call? It is the act of the Holy Spirit by which He through the Gospel graciously calls and gathers us, offers us the grace of God, and gives us power to accept it.

The call, according to this presentation, has a double force, that of the means by which it is effected: it presents grace and it confers grace; it conveys grace to the sinner, it bestows grace on the sinner, and it induces the sinner to accept grace. Mark well, this is the first act of that sanctification by which the Spirit sanctifies the elect, and which Dietrich has adduced as the second reason why He is called holy.

The first proof-text which Dietrich cites for the doctrine of the call is 2 Tim. 1, 9: "God hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Dietrich's line of thought is quite plainly this, that the elect are called, because they are elect. Now it is Dietrich's teaching that the call makes believers. Accordingly, already at this point, at the very first mention of the subject of election in his catechism, Dietrich teaches that the elect believe, because they are elected. For, he teaches, 1) that the called are called, because they are elected; 2) that the believers believe, because they are called. It will not be easy to deduce from these premises any other conclusion than that the believers believe, because they are elected. If Dietrich had viewed the faith of the elect as antecedent to the act of their election, it would have been illogical, it would have been false for him to say: "The Holy Spirit sanctifies the

elect." He might, and must have said: "The Holy Spirit elects the sanctified." At least at this point, then, Dietrich's Catechism presents the divine election as a solid wall of grace, with not a chink in it for the *ex praevisa fide* theory to squeeze through and to light up the mystery of the antemundane counsels of God.

This presentation is not varied, when Dietrich takes up the subject of election for special elucidation, but the original teaching already exhibited in the initial questions of the Third Article is consistently maintained. Qu. 320 reads:

For whom is this glory and happiness of eternal life designed? Only for believers, who continue in the true faith unto their end, Matt. 24, 13; because for these, by the election of God, the kingdom is prepared from the foundation of the world. Matt. 25, 34.

What, then, is the divine election of grace? It is that act of God by which He, according to the purpose of His will, alone out of His grace and mercy in Christ has resolved to save all those who shall steadfastly believe in Christ, to the praise of His glorious grace.

This answer states what? It names, 1) the elector, *God*; it states, 2) the moving cause of election, *the purpose of His will, His grace and mercy in Christ*; it describes 3) the elect, *those who shall steadfastly believe in Christ*; it states, 4) the end or aim of election, *to the praise of His glorious grace*. The third point requires special attention. In his *Institutiones* Dietrich dissects this answer in exactly the same manner as we have done. Ad 3) he remarks: "Objectum electionis sunt homines (non angeli), et quidem non promiscue quivis, quoquo modo se habentes (contr. Huber. act. Huberian. part. 2. p. 7. 20), sed in Christum *perseveranter* credituri, quae descriptio electorum est a causis intermediis, nempe fide, ejusque relato, in Christum, et adjuncta perseverantia ad finem. *Praesupponitur autem causa efficiens fidei principalis Spiritus s. et intermedia ministerium verbi, per quod is fidem in renatis accendit.*" We would emphasize in this citation, firstly, that Dietrich declares that sub 3) he has given merely a "description of the elect as viewed from the standpoint of intermediary causes." We shall have occasion later to refer to the use of the term "cause"

by Dietrich and the old dogmaticians. Secondly, we wish to emphasize that Dietrich himself is very careful to add his *caveat* ad 3), viz., that faith must not be viewed in this matter aside from its efficient causes, the Spirit and the Word. Why this warning?!

The proof-texts which Dietrich offers for his statements in Qu. 321 are, first and foremost, the standard election text, Eph. 1, 3—6. The deep language of this text: "God hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ, according as He hath chosen us in Him;" "God hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself;" "God in His grace" (comp. "wherein" with its antecedent) "hath made us accepted in the Beloved," — these profound utterances Dietrich has reduced to the simple statement: "God has elected believers in Christ." In this simple form he proposes to present the mystery of election to the child's mind, who shall use his catechism. — The second proof-text which he adduces is John 15, 16: "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." This text is to rivet upon the reader's memory the *sola gratia* characteristic of the believer's election. Dietrich means to say: The believers in Christ who were chosen were not men who had chosen God. Now, if believing means deciding in favor of God, choosing God, which it certainly does mean, and if Dietrich wished to teach that the believers in Christ were elected, *because* they believed, it was misleading, it was incorrect, it was false to cite John 15, 16 at this place. For if it had been Dietrich's view that God elected in view of foreseen persevering faith in Christ, God would have chosen such as had chosen Him first, and such an act of God could never be substantiated by John 15, 16.

These are the only texts which Dietrich cites in full under this question, but he adds several references which he would have the reader look up in his Bible, viz., Matt. 25, 34: "Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." This reference brings out

the truth that those who enter heaven enter a place that was made ready for them before they ever had breath or being, and that they "inherit" their Father's possessions, not take possession of what they have acquired. For if one should argue that the following verses show *why* the kingdom was prepared for just these people, namely, that it was done on account of their God-pleasing conduct, he would have to assume as the reason in the divine mind for the *discretio personarum* not foreseen faith, but foreseen works. That would not be a mild synergism, but a veritable hyper-synergism, a synergism with a vengeance, a synergism that would virtually place the Day of Judgment ahead of the elective act, and represent God as suspending His choice until He has pronounced the verdict of the Day of Doom on the sinner's conduct on earth up to the very hour of his death; in other words, it would exhibit God as electing sinners unto eternal life after He has in His prescience beheld them dying in the faith, or as deciding that He will take them to Himself in heaven, after He has seen them go to heaven. What practical purpose such an election is to serve, this is, indeed, a mystery. — Dietrich's second reference is to Acts 13, 48: "As many as were ordained unto eternal life believed." This text illustrates, by way of an example, by an historical incident, who those believers in Christ are of whom Dietrich has said that God elected them: they were men like the Gentiles who had heard Paul preach at Antioch in Pisidia and had accepted his Gospel. And why did they believe? Because they "were ordained to eternal life," *i. e.*, elected. We should have to throw out of Dietrich's Catechism at this place this reference, too, if it were Dietrich's aim to teach an election *intuitu fidei*. — Phil. 4, 3 is the third reference: "I entreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which labored with me in the Gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow-laborers, whose names are in the book of life." This and the four remaining references²⁾ simply serve

2) Luke 10, 20: "Rejoice, because your names are written in heaven." Dan. 12, 1: "Thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found

to enrich the child's memory with a very sweet phrase of Scripture, and to impress the mysterious act of the election on the mind by a very forcible illustration.

We have given Dietrich's definition of election *in toto*, with all the Scripture proof which he offers. What does it teach? It names the causes of election and describes the elect. The elect, namely, are believing Christians. Now, this Qu. 321 is one of the questions which are said to have compelled the Missouri Synod to discard Dietrich's Catechism. All our opponents on the doctrine of election read these words: "God has resolved to save all those who shall steadfastly believe in Christ" thus: "God has resolved to save all those of whom He foresaw that they would," etc. If we had so read Dietrich, we should certainly have become suspicious. But we never read him thus. We do not believe that when a person states: God has elected believing Christians, that means: God foresaw that certain persons would believe, and elected them on the ground of such foreknowledge. We believe that if a person desires to express the latter sentiment, there is a way in the language of men to do that, but Dietrich's is not that way. Dietrich, in his catechism, simply states the sound doctrine, that the elect are believers, and not unbelievers. Dietrich, by his brief characterization of the elect, merely wants to preclude a Calvinistic conception of election, an election without any regard to the means and method of attaining the end of election.

That this is the sole and the whole reason why Dietrich says: "God elected believing Christians" is shown by the context. His next question reads:

What is the nature of that decree of God, according to which He has resolved to save those who believe in Christ? It is not unconditional, but is so fixed, according to a certain order, as to embrace all the causes and means of our salvation.

written in the Book." Rev. 20, 15: "Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Hebr. 12, 23: "To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven."

Here again the phrase, "not unconditional," has been cited against us. As a rule, two negatives amount to an affirmative. But that Dietrich does not understand "not unconditional" in the sense of "conditional" is shown by the adversative clause which he places over against the statement: "It is not unconditional;" for he proceeds, "But is *so fixed, according to a certain order.*" What Dietrich wishes to contrast is not a decree of election which imposes upon the person elect the fulfillment of a condition and a decree which imposes no such condition, but a decree which lays down the bare fact: This person shall be saved, and a decree which declares: This person shall be saved for this reason and in this manner. Now, if we bear in mind what Dietrich had before stated regarding the various stages of the *ordo salutis*, in particular, that he had denied to man all power whatever to prepare himself for the reception of divine grace, or to accept such grace, or to quicken spiritual life in his dead heart, and that his faith is by the operation of God, it is manifest that he has left no condition in the strict sense of the word to be fulfilled by the elect. What he seems to call a condition is, in reality, the plan or order which God has laid down for the salvation of sinners. We might call this an unhappy use of the term "conditional," and might prefer an apter phraseology, but since the author has by his presentation of the doctrine of conversion sufficiently guarded his teaching at this place against misconstruction, we do not find it impossible to connect a correct meaning with his words.

By this statement, then, Dietrich wishes to clear himself of all semblance of teaching an absolute election, an arbitrary, blind choice at random and haphazard. The nature of the divine decree of election, — this is what Dietrich wishes to say, — is that it proceeds according to a certain order; and that order is that "all the causes and means of our salvation" shall be "embraced" in the decree. In other words, in the decree of election God does not decide upon the bare fact that He will save someone, but He decides why and how He will save someone.

What are the causes and means as embraced in this decree? Dietrich names them in the question immediately following. This is *the renowned question which is said to teach a three-fold cause of election*, and which is believed to have put Dietrich's Catechism out of commission in the Missouri Synod. The question reads:

What are those causes *and means* of salvation? 1. The boundless mercy of God, 2 Tim. 1, 9 (Qu. 288); 2. the infinite merit of Christ, which is to be proclaimed through the Gospel, Eph. 1, 3—6 (Qu. 321); 3. persevering faith in Christ, 2 Thess. 2, 13.

We have italicized the *punctum saliens* in this question. Dietrich does not use the term "cause" in this question, or elsewhere in his works, exclusively in its strict and native sense, to denote the power or efficient agent producing any thing or event, but, in employing this term, he follows, to a great extent, at least, scholastic usage, which in his days admitted of a wide and varied application. Even the end aimed at used to be denominated a "cause" in those days, namely, the final cause. *This explains why Dietrich can couple "causes" with "means."*^{2b} He views salvation as the great end to be attained by the divine election, and he purposes to tell how this end is attained, what is the efficient agent or agents, and what the instrumental agent or agents for securing the end. All these he names in one compacted statement, without separating the forces that move God from the forces that move man towards the achievement of the end of salvation. His second division couples the merit of Christ with the Gospel. Logically and materially these are two separate objects, and if exact logical precision had been Dietrich's aim, he should undoubtedly have divided them, and instead of naming three "causes and means"

2b) A curious parallel is found in Luther's Church Postil (second sermon for First Sunday after Trinity, Erlang. Ed. 12, 437): "Christ begins to teach what is the new birth, and how it is effected, though at this place He does not yet comprise all points which belong to it, but shows, in the first place, only causas efficientes, causes and means (Ursachen und Mittel), by which this new birth," etc.

should have named four. But such was not his aim; he leaves it to the reader, *whom he has previously instructed* as to the truly efficient causes of salvation and the instruments which God has appointed for obtaining salvation, to separate in his mind the *causae causantes* from what should strictly be called means. *He refers the reader to former questions and answers, and demands that their contents shall not be left out of consideration at this point.* And that he cannot intend to have persevering faith in Christ regarded as a *causa causans* is evident, because he names this concept at a place where, according to the very arrangement of his question, we should expect him to name means; he puts the concept of faith last, after the Gospel. Moreover, he cites as his proof passage 2 Thess. 2, 13: "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," ἐν πίστει, *i. e.*, the salvation to which God has chosen is actually effected in this way that the Holy Spirit sanctifies the elect by faith in the truth. Faith is the means of salvation *ex parte hominis*, as the Gospel, the Truth, is the means *ex parte Dei*.

Moreover, in this famous Qu. 323 Dietrich speaks of "*those causes and means.*" Which? Those to which he had referred in the preceding answer, *viz.*, the causes and means "embraced" in the decree of God. Faith, too, was embraced in the elective act. God determined that His elect must be saved not without faith, but by faith, faith being the means. Now, if God elected in view of faith, faith could not be "embraced," included as an integral part, in the elective act, but faith would be outside of that act as the guiding principle of God's choice. Faith would be the outside rule enabling God to make what is called a "rational" choice.

So, this assertion of a threefold cause of election in Qu. 323 of Dietrich's Catechism is utterly baseless. This good old theologian is misrepresented by those who pretend to maintain his teaching at this late day.

Dietrich's Catechism teaches an election unto faith. If this has not already appeared from the foregoing citations, we

offer here another proof. In Qu. 325 Dietrich puts the momentous question:

Whence is it, then, that not all and every person, for whom these means of salvation are designed, is equally chosen to eternal life? It is because God has purposed not to elect them absolutely and unconditionally, but with this *appointment* and in this order, *that they should* through the Gospel *believe* in Jesus Christ, and by true faith in Him be saved. But because the greatest number do not believe, it necessarily follows that only those who believe unto the end, and therefore but few, are chosen.

We have again taken the liberty to italicize. Dietrich does not say that the reason for the *discretio personarum* is that God knew that the elect would believe, and that the non-elect would not believe, but that God elected the elect "with this appointment, that they should believe."

One thing we shall grant our opponents with regard to Dietrich's Catechism, viz.: his phraseology is not that which Missourians during the present controversy have employed towards their opponents. But Missourians are not the first people, nor are they the only ones at this late day who have discovered that the use of scholastic terminology in dogmatics is not an unalloyed blessing. Dietrich himself is not consistent in the use of the terms causes and means. In Qu. 324—the question following immediately after the question which is claimed to teach three causes—we find the following language:

But are not these means of salvation appointed for all men without exception?

Certainly; for, etc.

"*These means*"—which? Why, those mentioned in the preceding question. But that question spoke of "*causes and means*"? So it did. And now Dietrich calls the same matters "*these means*" which he had before called causes and means. But perhaps he has dropped the causes in Qu. 324, and by the pronoun "*these*" refers not to the whole of the preceding question, but to a part of it, namely, to that part which named the means. If any one so interprets the expression "*these means*," he grants that the preceding question has named *at*

least two means — which is what we have claimed. And since “the boundless mercy of God” and “the infinite merit of Christ” rather answer to the designation “cause” than to that of “means,” the means to which Dietrich in Qu. 324 points as having been mentioned in Qu. 323 must be “the Gospel” and “persevering faith in Christ,” — which is what we have claimed.

However, we doubt the correctness of this interpretation. Dietrich’s answer to Qu. 324 does not agree with it. It reads:

Certainly; for 1. God sincerely desires to have mercy upon all men; and wills that all should be saved and that none should perish. This corresponds to point 1 in Qu. 323.

2. Christ is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world; He is the Savior of all men, especially of those who believe.

This corresponds to point 2 a under Qu. 323.

3. God calls all to the benefits of Christ, with the sincere will that all should become partakers; and the Gospel is preached to every creature, to the end that all men everywhere should repent and come to the knowledge of the truth.

This corresponds to point 2 b under Qu. 323. And this is all there is contained in Answer 324. There is no equivalent for point 3 in Qu. 323. In Qu. 325 Dietrich says, that God has made “this appointment and this order, that they” (*i. e.*, “each and every person for whom these means of salvation are designed”) “should through the Gospel believe in Jesus Christ and by true faith in Him be saved.” Here he declares the power of the Gospel to be as universal in the intention of God as is the commission to preach the Gospel. We have seen before that Dietrich deduces faith only from the Holy Spirit working through the Gospel. He might have added a fourth feature to his 324th answer. For faith is also a means, and God desires to bestow it as sincerely as He bestowed His love, His Son, and His Word of grace. Now two of those three matters which Dietrich in Qu. 324 mentions and calls means, we should strictly name causes, namely, the two first. Hence, we hold that no argument pro or con the part which faith is

supposed to play in the elective act of God can be deduced from the use of the terms "causes" by Dietrich. Dietrich is not exact, and does not aim to be exact, in the use of these terms. This lack of exactness begets a sort of indistinctness in his statements. No doubt, Dietrich was laboring to maintain the strict teaching of the Form of Concord and at the same time to accommodate himself also to the dogmatical language of his day. This is a defect, but it is not sufficient to stamp him a heterodox teacher. For at the decisive point Dietrich is clear and plain: he has nowhere in his Catechism represented faith as a *causa causans* of election. Even this lack of exactness has not caused the Missouri Synod to dispense with his Catechism. Dietrich has satisfied the teachers of his Catechism in the Missouri Synod on what, after all, is the main issue, viz., Does man, in any wise, cooperate towards originating faith in himself? To this question he has returned a plain and unqualified *no* for his answer. He has said:

Qu. 283. Can, then, no one, in his conversion to God, do anything by his own power?

Not at all; for just on this account "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him."

Qu. 284. Why is this?

Because by the fall of our first parents all the powers of our intellect and will are so entirely corrupted, that we are not able of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves.

Qu. 285. Has man, then, since the fall, a free will before conversion?

1. In civil and external actions he has, although it is weakened in various ways, on account of

- a. the corruption of nature,
- b. the wiles of the devil,
- c. the power of passion,
- d. the errors of judgment.

2. In spiritual matters man is wholly dead and has no freedom of will, so that he cannot prepare himself for divine grace, *nor accept it when it is offered* (italics our own!), nor awaken himself to conversion and renewal, *just as a dead man cannot restore himself to life or communicate any power to himself.* (Italics our own!)

Qu. 286. Whence, then, does conversion to God and faith in Jesus Christ (note the juxtaposition!) come?

It is a gracious gift of the Holy Ghost, who works both in us by His mighty power.

In unmistakable language Dietrich passes the *subjectum conversionis*, fallen man, on from the state of spiritual death to that of spiritual life, with no probationary state intervening, and ascribes the transfer to God alone. He treats "conversion to God" and "faith in Jesus Christ" as equivalent terms.

Nor does he distinguish between two kinds of resistance to explain the origin of faith in some persons, the failure to believe in others. He knows but of one kind of resistance, and that explains unbelief.

Qu. 325. Whence is it, then, that not all and every person, for whom these means of salvation are designed, is equally chosen to eternal life?

It is because God has purposed not to elect them absolutely and unconditionally, but with this appointment and in this order, that they should through the Gospel believe in Jesus Christ, and by true faith in Him be saved. But because the greatest number do not believe, it necessarily follows that only those who believe unto the end, and therefore but few, are chosen.

Qu. 326. But why is it that not all persons are endowed with faith through the Gospel, and believe in Christ?

This is because of their own fault, inasmuch as they voluntarily despise and reject the Word preached, and thus resist the operations of the Holy Ghost.

Qu. 327. But whence does it come that the greater number is rejected and damned?

This also is due to their own fault, to their impenitence and unbelief; for he that believeth not shall be damned, and the wrath of God abideth on him.

Plainly this presentation leaves the question: *Cur alii prae aliis?* the mystery which it is. We may know why some are saved and why others are not saved. But there is no answer on the question why some are saved rather than others from the Scriptures, which teach with equal emphasis both the

universality and equality of sin and the universality and equality of grace.

Dietrich's Catechism was in use in the churches and schools of the Missouri Synod about thirty years before the Catechism now in use was adopted. During that time the schoolchildren and catechumens of the Missouri Synod were taught the doctrine of election which the Missouri Synod now holds. Dietrich's Catechism proved no bar to teaching that doctrine. The allegation made at Fort Wayne is not new. In 1881 C. S. K. wrote in *The St. Louis Theological Monthly*³⁾ as follows:

After the death of the blessed Prof. A. Biewend, which occurred April 10, 1858, Dr. Walther instructed the whole Concordia Gymnasium, which was then yet at St. Louis, in the catechism. The ten commandments had been catechised on by Prof. Biewend. Dr. Walther continued where the latter had left off, and, towards the end of the year, he catechised on the doctrine of election in the Third Article according to Dietrich's Catechism. The writer of this article . . . begs leave to produce, not from memory, but from his notes taken down at the time, the following sufficient evidence to show that Dr. Walther has not in the least changed his position relative to the doctrine of election, but that he is the same man in theology in regard to this point that he was over 22 years ago, at least. He, for instance, said that the answer to Qu. 321 in Dietrich stated, first, that election of grace is an "*act of God*," then, that it is "*a voluntary act*," then, that it is "*no unconditional act*," he said that "*not a condition of election*," but "*a description of the elect*" was given in the words: "all those who shall perseveringly believe in Christ," and that the answer finally pointed out the "*ultimate end*" of election, which is "the praise of His glorious grace." Further notes make Prof. Walther say the following: "The Calvinists say God elected a few, but as He did not know how to get them to heaven, He decreed to send His Son."—"Election is the cause of the faith" (of the elect). "*Right! God Himself gives faith.*" In the catechisation on the words: "All things work together for good to them that love God" (in Rom. 8, 28—30, under Qu. 322), he said: "When an elect sins, that also must work for good to him. If any one is not elected, neither good nor evil will be of avail to him." "*It flows from God's*

3) Vol. I, p. 131 f.: "Dr. Walther once and now."

mercy (Erbarmung) alone that He elected some. God is incomprehensible, not only in His nature and works, but also in His decrees. When the Calvinists cannot comprehend what God does, they cast a goodly portion away, and God is made to be a hideous God, and a liar and cruel tyrant. Many errors are connected with the absolute decree, viz.: that Christ did not die for all men, that grace is irresistible, etc." Speaking of the elect who continue in faith unto their end, Prof. Walther said: "God did *not* elect a person (einen) on account of faith, but a person always continues in faith because God elected him." In regard to answer to Qu. 323, Dr. Walther said: "The two first" ("the boundless *mercy of God* and the infinite *merit of Christ*") "*are the only causes, but the third*" ("persevering faith in Christ") "*and what belongs to the same, are the means.*"

The history of the new catechism of the Missouri Synod begins about a year after the publication of the first edition of Dietrich's Catechism. Up to 1857 various catechisms and explanations of catechisms were in use. In that year the ministerium of St. Louis, which three years before had been appointed a committee for that purpose, reported to the general body then convened at Fort Wayne, Ind., that it had completed the draft for the proposed edition of Dietrich. Another committee was appointed to examine the manuscript, and upon its favorable report the manuscript was ordered printed. On February 28, 1858, Dr. Walther in *Der Lutheraner* announced that the catechism had left the press of Wiebusch and Son, and in his review of the same said:

Unless all teachers in explaining the catechism follow a common model, the consequence must necessarily be not only that a great divergence will arise in the presentation of the pure doctrine on the part of the teachers within the same church-body, but also that the individual teacher will not adhere to a uniform presentation, but, in proportion as he is faithful and diligent, will adopt every year a method as regards terminology, quantity of material, and mode of inculcating, which in his opinion is an improvement upon that of the preceding year. Such topics as Law and Gospel, faith and repentance, justification and sanctification, the sacrament, etc., will be explained now in this, now in that manner. Now, although none of the explanations offered need be false, still the damage resulting from a constant change in the mode of teaching is very great. Neces-

sarily, such a constant change not only creates confusion in the children's minds, but also reacts in a harmful manner upon the teacher himself: it engenders in him a kind of uncertainty greatly detrimental to him in his office and causes him to vacillate in points of doctrine. This cannot but prove a great hindrance to the building up of the Church in the true unity of the Spirit, and conflicts with the apostle's admonition: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you: but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. 1, 10.

These remarks afford a glimpse of the state of affairs in the Synod prior to the coming of Dietrich's Catechism, and they indicate with what expectations the catechism was issued. Hopes of another kind accompanied its publication. The reviewer continues:

With no intention of denying the great value and excellence of any other orthodox catechism our synod has chosen just this older catechism of Dietrich, because in preference to all other catechisms which were known to synod this one seemed best suited to our times and our peculiar conditions in this country. Our congregation members and our children are not dwelling in this country in quiet possession of the pure doctrine. Surrounded by sects of the most varied description, they notice not only that the good old pure and sound doctrine and the time-honored customs of their church are assailed and rendered suspected, but also that the false teachings and consequent practices of sects, partly of the rationalistic, partly of the enthusiastic stripe, are lauded with enticing glamor, and their adoption advocated to them. Manifestly, then, we need a text-book for our schools and homes which not only presents with particular care and depth the pure doctrine of our church, its customs and entire practice, thoroughly proves their soundness from God's Word and strikingly disproves the objections raised against them, but which also exhibits in a clear and lucid manner the groundless and dangerous character of the errors, the sentimentalism and the mispractices in vogue in our country. We need a catechism which possesses, besides the common merits of orthodox catechisms, this additional merit, that it offers to our congregation members the necessary weapons for successfully defending the truth which by the grace of God has been bestowed on them, and for vanquishing error in whatever garb it meets them, hence, a catechism which so furnishes them that in the

midst of the whirlpool of sects in this country they are able to comply with the admonition of the holy apostle: "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you." 1 Pet. 3, 15.

Such were the ideals which the makers of Missouri's first synodical catechism proposed for their constituents. Were these ideals ever attained? *Nine months after* the above notice, an anonymous contributor is permitted to state a grievance regarding the use of Dietrich's Catechism in *Der Lutheraner*.⁴⁾ He writes:

My dear friend,—

I have to ask your advice this time in a very peculiar matter. I know you will gladly give it. The time to begin the instruction of catechumens has arrived again, and, as on every previous occasion, I am again perplexed, yea, more so this time than ever before. Formerly my perplexity arose from not knowing which book to follow in my instruction and to place into the children's hands. Nearly every year I adopted a different course, different explanations, and gave a different amount of time to various doctrines. Not that I was lazy or negligent. I wrote out my instruction in full every time, but I was never satisfied at the new start with what I had written and presented in the preceding year. Now this difficulty has been removed. Synod has republished Conrad Dietrich's Small Catechism. We have the book; we have introduced it; my children have it. Now guess what difficulty perplexes me at present. Do not laugh at me. What to do with the book I know as little as my pupils. Are the children to learn only the proof-passages? What purpose, then, do the questions and answers serve? If they are to learn also the questions and answers, how is that possible? Hardly one or two will accomplish this. Am I to have them merely read the questions and answers? Of what use will that be? However, if I am to explain the questions, I hardly know what to explain; everything is so clear and plain. Then again, many things seem to me to be wanting which I had found in Spener, or in the Dresden Catechism, or in Huth, etc. There are no terse applications such as one finds scattered in those catechisms. In some places the matter is brief and condensed, in others it is too much expanded. And how lumbering are some of the answers! In fine, I am disgusted. And when

4) Vol. 15, p. 57 f. Nov. 30, 1858.

my disgust and perplexity occasionally is great, I am angry at heart because synod did not publish a different catechism, one elaborated with an eye for the special needs of our time, etc.

This brother was advised to consider that every undertaking presents peculiar difficulties at the beginning, but persistent effort and faithful perseverance would overcome those difficulties. Moreover, it would not be easy, the reply states, to find a person capable and of sufficient authority in the Church at that day to elaborate an entirely new catechism adapted to American conditions. — The difficulties, however, seem to have continued. In the issue for September 15, 1864, a writer proposes "Another method for treating Conrad Dietrich's Catechism."⁵) He says, amongst other things:

It is impossible, in view of the present state of our schools, to have the children memorize the long questions, and yet the children must be able to give an account of them. What remedy can be proposed? A simple one, viz., by means of the questions themselves. A close examination of the questions reveals the fact that most questions contain, 1. a generalizing, 2. a particularizing answer. In other words, from a long answer containing general and particular matter, a brief and yet complete answer may be culled. This brief answer the children are directed to commit to memory; the remainder they are merely asked to remember. Thus the children are encouraged to take up the long questions, especially when the latter are divided, — as sometimes must be done, — into main and secondary questions, and in this wise the children, without becoming aware of it, are taught the entire contents of the question.

The process is as follows: You take the catechism in your left and a pencil in your right hand, and examine, *e. g.*, Qu. 84 in the Sixth Commandment: What is meant by committing adultery? In the answer you underscore and have the children underscore these words: "to yield to the lust of the flesh." These words, you tell the children, must be memorized; the remainder, "outside of lawful wedlock," and the four special points you tell them to remember. In like manner, in Qu. 86, etc.

A person wielding a good pencil might in this manner digest (*durcharbeiten*) the entire catechism and communicate results at

⁵) Vol. 21, p. 13.

conferences or synodical meetings. This would prove useful in several ways: 1. The great number of self-appointed masters with their peculiar modes and methods would perish and would be strictly bound to the catechism; 2. the woes and agonies of the children would be at an end; 3. the contents of the catechism would be brought much nearer to their grasp; and lastly, 4. children in New York and San Francisco, in New Orleans and at Lake Superior would return the identical answer to a given question.

These suggestions show that the expectations with which Dietrich's Catechism had been issued were being realized very slowly, yea, that not a few were despairing of realizing them. The demands for a plainer, simpler, briefer catechism at length became so insistent that "An Abridged Edition of the Catechism of Dr. Johann Conrad Dietrich" was published by the Publication Board of Synod. The six hundred and eleven questions of Dietrich had been reduced to one hundred and fifty-four in the Abridgment. Before us lies a copy of the *tenth* edition of this Abridgment, of the year 1883. Dietrich's elaborate presentation of the doctrine of election has been entirely dropped in the Abridgment. And this had been done before there was so much as a thought of the coming predestinarian controversy. What changes were made were meant to answer practical necessities. To borrow a secular phrase, the Missouri Synod was confronted with a condition, not a theory, and strove to supply an existing want.

It was in this same spirit that ultimately the idea of publishing the Catechism now largely in use in the Missouri Synod was weighed and executed. The facts are of too recent date to be here reiterated. Synod was in no haste to rid itself of its Dietrich for doctrinal reasons. The proposition to publish a new catechism was not submitted to Synod until 1890. The Committee reporting on the matter states:⁶⁾

We are prompted by the following reasons to submit this petition to Synod: In the first place, we cannot but yield to the conviction that Conrad Dietrich's explanation of the catechism now in general use among us was intended to offer to *confirmed* young

6) Records of Sixth Delegate Convention 1890, p. 81 f.

Christians further instruction and a more thorough inculcation of the doctrines of the Catechism, but that for schoolchildren it contains too much matter. Moreover, the doctrines are treated by Dietrich in too rigid connection, so that it is very difficult for a teacher to select just so much doctrinal matter as he regards appropriate for his pupils, by using only a part of the questions and passing over the rest. Accordingly, we believe that it is meeting a want of our beloved youth to offer them a briefer explanation of the Catechism, in which they find just the right quantity of spiritual food.

In the second place, it is our opinion that in many places Dietrich's Catechism employs a language which is adapted to the grasp of college students of the middle grades,—for whom he had primarily written the catechism,—but that his language is difficult to understand for many children in our parochial schools, especially in the lower grades. Accordingly, we believe it to be in the interest of our schoolchildren that an easier exposition of the catechism be given them, which presents the pure doctrine of the catechism in plain and simple words.

In the third place, we are convinced that it will conduce to the spiritual welfare of our children to have as the basis of religious instruction an explanation of the catechism which, from beginning to end, closely follows Luther's Small Catechism and affords a clear knowledge and understanding of the text of the catechism in all its parts. If good catechetical literature, especially Luther's writings and the confessional writings of our church, are used in the elaboration of the desired handbook, a churchly and ecumenical character can be preserved, in our judgment, also to this new work.

In conclusion, we wish to remark, that we do not wish to be understood as advising a rescission of the former resolution of Synod by which Conrad Dietrich's book was recommended for use to our congregations; for, no doubt, Dietrich will be used with blessed results also in the future, especially in the instruction of more advanced children," etc.

It was not until 1896 that the new catechism received Synod's sanction,⁷⁾ Synod at the same time

expressing the hope that this new catechism would meet a want long felt, and would prove a great blessing to the congregations. Every teacher would now be able, by the aid of this catechism, to teach all the saving doctrines easily in the space of a year, and the pastor

7) Records of Eighth Delegate Convention, 1896, p. 113.

would no longer be forced, in teaching his catechumens, to lay aside so many questions. However, this is not meant as an order that every congregation must adopt this catechism; this may or may not be done. Synod is satisfied with having declared that in this little book the pure and unadulterated doctrine of the divine Word is presented in a form which, according to her conviction, will prove very salutary.

Ten years have elapsed since the introduction of Schwan's Catechism, as the catechism of Synod is popularly called. Many, probably the greater portion of our congregations, have adopted it and are using it exclusively. However, Dietrich is used still, sometimes by the side of Schwan, sometimes exclusively. At Concordia Seminary this city Dietrich's was the student's text-book in English Catechetics as late as 1905. For practical reasons Schwan was used for the first time in the fall of that year. We were curious to know just to what extent Dietrich's Catechism was still in demand and addressed an inquiry to that effect to the Agent of our Publication Concern, who replies under date of June 5th, as follows:

Schwan's Catechism was published in April, 1896. Since that time we have sold, besides the latter, 71,491 copies of Dietrich's Catechism. Dietrich is still printed by us just as in previous years, and so far no order for it has remained unfilled.

On the average, then, there are still used annually in the Missouri Synod at the present time 7100 copies of Dietrich's Catechism. We are confident that there is not a synod in America, nor anywhere else in the world, the Ohio and Iowa Synods, and the General Council not excepted, which makes as extensive an use of Dietrich's Catechism as does the Missouri Synod.

Therefore we hold that whoever says that the Missouri Synod on doctrinal grounds dispensed with the use of Dietrich's Catechism does not know what he is saying, or does not care, or both.

WASHINGTON THE CHRISTIAN.¹⁾

When two months old, George Washington was baptized; likely by the Rev. Lawrence De Butts, the pastor of Washington parish. He was carefully brought up in the Christian religion by his mother, and many biographers give her much credit for what he became. Paulding tells us this Christian matron read daily to her household the "Contemplations" of Sir Matthew Hale, the illustrious and Christian judge of the corrupt court of Charles II, which contain a long and minute series of Meditations on the Lord's Prayer. No doubt this family worship went far to form the character of young George.

As far back as 1624 it is recorded that the young were catechised from Lent to far into the summer. Being the son of a vestryman, George no doubt was taught the Christian religion by the pastor of Truro parish, the Rev. Charles Green.

When Washington was a lad of thirteen, he wrote in a blank book a list of maxims for the guidance of young people. Here are some of them: "Speak not injurious words, neither in jest nor in earnest. Be not hasty to believe flying reports to the disparagement of any. Be not apt to relate news if you know not the truth thereof. Be careful to keep your promise. Speak not evil of the absent. When you speak of God, or His attributes, let it be seriously in reverence. Honor and obey your natural parents, although they be poor. Let your recre-

1) *Authorities*: — Senator Lodge's *George Washington*; President Woodrow Wilson's *Washington*; Ford's *The True George Washington*; Lossing's *Washington*; Everett's *Washington*; Weems's *Washington*; Saunder's *Washington Centennial Souvenir*; Sparks's *Washington's Writings*, vol. 12; Collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, vol. 1; Vernon's *George Washington, Soldier and Christian*; Harbaugh's *Religious Character of Washington*; M'Guire's *Religious Opinions and Character of Washington*; Potter's *Washington in His Library and Life*; *The Century*, April, 1889; *The Treasury*, February, 1901; *Washington as Churchman and Communicant*, Address to the Drawing Room Club at the Waldorf-Astoria by Dr. Eliphalet Nott Potter, formerly President of Hobart College.

ations be manful, not sinful. Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire, called conscience." When fourteen, he was bent on going to sea, and his trunk was sent aboard the vessel. Returning to bid his mother good-by, he found her in tears. He promptly gave up his ambition and remained at home. His mother said, "God will not let your filial affection go unrewarded."

He learned surveying, and in 1748, when he was sixteen years old, he surveyed the vast estate of unexplored lands at the base of the Alleghenies belonging to Lord Fairfax, whose frequent companion he was. So well did he do this work among the hostile Indians, that Lord Fairfax procured him the office of public surveyor, which he held for three years.

George Washington was sullied with none of the vices then so common with the sons of planters; his morals were irreproachable; his habits, temperate; his sentiments, lofty; his health, perfect; his manners, easy and dignified; he loved society, but was no brilliant talker; he was a fine athlete; he loved fox-hunting; he was the best horseman in America; the British officers said they had never seen so heroic a figure as Washington on horseback.

During the Indian and French War Fairfax wrote to Washington at the Great Meadows, "I will not doubt your having public prayers in camp, especially when the Indian families are your guests, that they, seeing your plain manner of worship, may have their curiosity excited to be informed why we do not use the ceremonies of the French, which being well explained to their understanding, will more and more dispose them to receive our baptism, and unite in strict bonds of cordial friendship." This letter speaks volumes for the Christian character of young George Washington—it takes for granted that he prays publicly and is a missionary! "During the French War, when the government of Virginia neglected to provide chaplains for the army, he remonstrated against such impropriety, and urged his request till they were appointed." To Governor Dinwiddie he wrote, "Common decency, sir, in a

camp, calls for the services of a divine, which ought not to be dispensed with, although the world should be so uncharitable as to think us void of religion and incapable of good instructions." Colonel B. Temple says, "frequently, on the Sabbath, he has known Colonel Washington to perform divine service with his regiment, reading the Scriptures and praying with them." The chaplain being wounded, Washington himself read the burial service by the light of a torch at the burial of General Braddock. At this period Washington writes, "I have, both by threats and persuasive means, endeavored to discountenance gaming, drinking, swearing, and irregularities of every other kind."

In the midst of his many pressing duties, Washington often visited his mother at Fredericksburg and provided for her wants. In his letters he always addressed her as "Honored Madam," and signed himself, "Your most dutiful son." He attended his half-brother Lawrence to the end, in 1752, when Lawrence's own brother Augustine would but seldom visit the consumptive. At the death of the daughter of his half-brother Lawrence, he fell heir to the Mount Vernon estate. In 1759 he married his "dear Patsey," the widow Martha Custis, who owned vast tracts of land in Kent County and £45,000, and he was perhaps the wealthiest man in all the colonies.

He was elected vestryman in the two parishes of Truro and Fairfax, and was quite active in church affairs. When the merits of two sites for the Pohick church were warmly discussed, Washington himself went to the trouble of measuring the distance from each proposed site to the house of each parishioner to find out which was the nearer place for all, and then laid the matter before the vestry; needless to say that on the basis of these statistics the spot favored by Washington was chosen. He drew the plans for the new church in Truro and subscribed to the building. Sparks quotes President Madison to the effect that "there was a tradition, that when he (Washington) belonged to the vestry of a church in his neigh-

borhood, and several little difficulties grew out of some division of the society, he sometimes spoke with great force, animation, and eloquence on the topics that came before them." In the elections of 1765 Washington stood third in popularity in the Truro church, and fifth in that of Fairfax.

The Rev. Lee Massey, rector at Pohick (Truro) church before the Revolution, said, "I never knew so constant an attendant in church as Washington. And his behavior in the house of God was ever so deeply reverential that it produced the happiest effect on my congregation, and greatly assisted me in my pulpit labors. No company ever withheld him from church. I have often been at Mount Vernon on Sabbath morning, when his breakfast table was filled with guests; but to him they furnished no pretext for neglecting his God and losing the satisfaction of setting a good example. For instead of staying at home, out of false complaisance to them, he used constantly to invite them to accompany him." And this, although he had seven miles to Pohick church and ten miles to Fairfax. Once when Mrs. Washington was not well and confined to the house, he would have attended church nevertheless, had not something else kept him home, as we may see from his diary of January 6, 1760. On Sunday evenings he read to his wife a sermon or a portion of the Bible. On May 4 he visited his negroes ill of the smallpox. In 1773, he bought a pew in Christ Church in Alexandria, paying £36.10, the largest price paid by any parishioner. To this church he was quite liberal, subscribing several times towards repairs, etc.

Washington asked a blessing at his own table, in a standing posture; if a clergyman was present, he was asked to pray. Once he forgot to ask a visiting clergyman to say grace, and when reminded of it afterwards he said, "Well, at any rate he will know that we are not graceless in this house."

Parson Green, first rector of Truro parish, had his corner at the fireside of Mount Vernon, and the Rev. Lee Massey, of Pohick church, was a friend of the family, as was the Rev.

Charles Kemp, and the Rev. Byran, Lord Fairfax; and to Parson Weems Mrs. Washington always gave a double spoonful of egg sauce when it fell to her to carve the chickens.

Washington's nephew, Mr. Lewis, says, that he had "accidentally witnessed his private devotions in his study both morning and evening; that on these occasions he had seen him in a kneeling posture, with a Bible open before him, and that he believed such to have been his daily practice."

When the port of Boston was closed by act of Parliament, the Virginia House of Congress set apart June 1 as a day of fasting and prayer, and the entry in Washington's journal reads, "June 1 went to church, and fasted all day." When he went to Philadelphia as a member of the first Congress, he went to church every Sunday, as we may see from his journal. At this time a stranger asked how he might know Washington; Secretary Thompson replied, "You can easily distinguish him when Congress goes to prayer: Washington is the gentleman who kneels down." When Bishop White made the first prayer in Congress, Washington was the only one observed to kneel.

One of his orders as General was, "The General requires and expects of all officers and soldiers, not engaged in actual duty, a punctual attendance on divine service, to implore the blessings of heaven upon the means used for our safety and defense." On July 9, 1775, he says, "The General hopes and trusts, that every officer and man will endeavor to live and act as becomes a Christian soldier." On February 26, 1776, he says, "All officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers, are positively forbid playing at cards and other games of chance. At this time of public distress, men may find enough to do in the service of their God and their country, without abandoning themselves to vice and immorality." On August 3, 1776, he says, "That the troops may have an opportunity of attending public worship . . . the General in future excuses them from fatigue duty on Sunday." On May 29, 1777, he says, "Let vice and immorality of every kind be discouraged as much

as possible in your brigade; and, as a chaplain is allowed to each regiment, see that the men regularly attend divine worship. Gaming of every kind is expressly forbidden." On December 17, 1777, "the General directs . . . that the chaplains perform divine service . . . and earnestly exhorts all officers and soldiers, whose absence is not indispensably necessary, to attend with reverence the solemnities of the day."

During the war Washington received the Lord's Supper from the Rev. Dr. Jones at Morristown, N. J. Isaac Potts saw the General on his knees in prayer in a thicket in Valley Forge. A woman testified that it was his habit to retire from the camp for prayer. The Rev. J. Eastburn saw him in prayer near the battle of Princeton. At still another time he was overheard at his private prayer, ending with the words, "Grant the petition of Thy servant for the sake of Him whom Thou hast called Thy Beloved Son." General Cobb says, "Throughout the war it was understood in his military family, that he gave a part of each day to private prayer and devotion." General Sullivan makes the same remark. Says an officer, Washington's nephew, "I took the papers from the messenger and directed my steps towards the General's room. I heard a voice within and paused. Listening for a moment, when all was silent around, I found that he was earnestly engaged in prayer. I knew this to be his habit, and therefore retired." At Yorktown he said to his soldiers, "My brave fellows, let no sensation of satisfaction for the triumphs you have gained induce you to insult your fallen enemy; let no shouting, no clamorous huzzaing increase their mortification. It is sufficient satisfaction for us that we witness their humiliation. Posterity will huzza for us!"

In his circular letter to the Governors of the States, on disbanding the army, he praises, "above all, the pure and benign light of Revelation," and in conclusion asks all to follow "the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation."

In his Farewell Address he says, "Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligations desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." When he bade farewell to the army, he offered "his recommendations to their grateful country, and his prayers to the God of Armies." When he bade farewell to Congress, he commended "the interests of our dearest country to the protection of Almighty God, and those who have the superintendence of them to His holy keeping."

When in New York City, President Washington worshiped regularly at St. Paul's Church. In Philadelphia, at Christ Church, the President was "a constant attendant in the morning." Here, when he had received a just reproof from the pulpit, he did not get angry, but honored the preacher for his integrity and candor and would never again give cause for the repetition of the reproof. When, in 1793, the yellow fever broke out in Philadelphia, he moved to Germantown and for six weeks boarded with the Rev. Dr. F. L. Herman, and attended the English services with his family; he even attended the German services, to set a good example.

While President, Washington usually retired to his study at nine o'clock every night for communion with his Bible and his God; no exception was made when he had company, receptions; and state dinners. On Sundays he would have no visitors; Trumbull, the Speaker of the House, an earnest Christian, was the only exception. At Philadelphia a youthful member of the President's household, whose room was near the study, on one occasion looked in and saw Washington upon his knees at a small table with a candle and an open Bible thereon. Traveling through Connecticut in the fall of 1789, Washington on Sunday "attended the morning and evening services and heard very lame discourses from a Mr. Pond."

With all his self-respect and natural dignity, Washington was modest and unassuming. When elected commander-in-chief, he frankly doubted his ability; yet without reluctance he accepted the trust, pledging to exert all his powers, under Providence, to lead the country through its trials. He indignantly rejected the overtures made privately to consent to be king. He was fearless of praise or blame, though not insensible to either. He was reserved in manner, yet capable of the warmest affection. He had a very fiery temper, but he usually kept it well under control. In 1754, when he was twenty-two years old, in an election contest in the market-place of Alexandria, Colonel Wm. Payne, little as he was, with a stick knocked down Colonel Washington, big as he was. Washington was in the wrong, with his fiery temper he had used insulting language. He was Christian enough to apologize the next day to his doughty little assailant; later he introduced him to his wife, mentioning the fact of their encounter, and always remained a warm friend.

He once said, "I can truly say, I had rather be at Mount Vernon with a friend or two about me, than to be attended at the seat of government by the officers of state and the representatives of every power of Europe." He said that more permanent and genuine happiness is to be found in connubial life than in the giddy rounds of pleasure or the scenes of successful ambition.

Washington would take no salary for his services to his country, but he consented to have his expenses refunded.

Washington's charities were not very conspicuous, but very judicious. Careful in the smallest expenses, he never turned a deaf ear to the many poor of the county. For their use he kept a granary full of corn, and a boat with a net in one of his best fisheries. The baker in the neighborhood of one of the "Virginia Springs" was ordered to supply a daily dole of bread to a number of very poor mountaineers, but not to tell the giver's name. Quite by chance it was found out to be Washington, as Governor Johnson of Maryland tells us. When

President at Philadelphia, "he incidentally heard some one speak of a very destitute family in the city. He asked for the number and street in which they lived. Soon after he visited this family in their lowly abode, spoke words of gentle sympathy to them, and, when leaving, pressed ten dollars into the trembling hand of the grateful widow." While very careful not to help the lazy, he was always ready to help the deserving. Even during the troublous times of the war he did not forget to do good. He wrote Lund Washington, the manager of his estate, to give about £40 to £50 a year to the worthy poor and seed corn to such as were in need of it. He founded the School for Boys in Alexandria, and for many years gave \$250.00 annually for the schooling of the poor, and left \$4000 to the institution, and \$10,000 to Liberty Hall Academy in Rockbridge County, and \$20,000 to a National University at Washington. All his slaves were to be freed at the death of his wife, who had the whole property for life, about \$530,000.

Jared Sparks says that in the twelve volumes of Washington's writings, "whenever he approaches it (the Christian revelation), and indeed when he alludes in any manner to religion, it is done with seriousness and reverence." Ford says, "In all public ways Washington threw his influence in favor of religion." President Madison says, "He was constant in his observance of worship." Chief Justice John Marshall says, "He was a sincere believer in the Christian faith, and a truly devout man."

When the doctors in New York told him that he was sick unto death, he said, "I am not afraid to die, and can bear the worst. Whether to-night or twenty years hence makes no difference. I know that I am in the hands of a good Providence."

His last sickness was less than twenty-four hours. To his doctor he said, "I die hard, but I am not afraid to go. I believed from my first attack that I should not survive it." He also said, "I should have been glad, had it pleased God, to die

a little easier, but I doubt not it is for my good." The Bible was on his dying bed; his beloved wife was kneeling by his side; he said, "I am just going. 'Tis well. Father of mercies, take me to Thyself!" — His epitaph is, "I am the Resurrection and the Life."

At his death Congress resolved, 1. to erect a grand marble monument, and, 2. to hold a funeral service in the German Lutheran church.

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

Deut. 6, 4: *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.*

Various renderings have been proposed for this passage, *e. g.*: "Jehovah is our God, Jehovah is one." (See Clarke, *The Holy Bible*, ad loc.) Inasmuch as our Lord cites this passage Mark 12, 29 in exactly the same sense and construction as the Authorized Version has given to our text, it is futile to attempt a different rendering. This text declares the *unity of God*. God is *achad*, one, *i. e.*, "beside me there is no God," Is. 44, 6; "there is none else," Is. 45, 5. 6. 14. 18. 22; "there is none like me," Is. 46, 9. Paganism acknowledges many gods; Israel's God is one Jehovah. And this very name He will not share with another, Is. 42, 8 ("that is *my* name"). God's name stands for the divine essence. God cannot be named by comparison with other similar beings. His name is as much His own exclusively as His attributes, properties, etc. God is one and Jehovah is His name, therefore, means: There is one eternal, one almighty, one omniscient, etc., Being or Essence. We cannot imagine two eternal, almighty, omnipresent Beings without imagining, at the same time, a constant conflict between the two. Or if they exist in harmony with one another, we imagine a power still higher than the two,

which controls them, and thereby destroys their omnipotence. — A divine name, indeed, has been conferred on beings other than God. Moses is made *elohim*, a god, to his brother Aaron, Ex. 4, 16, to Pharaoh, Ex. 7, 1. The civil authorities, Ex. 12, 12; 22, 28; 23, 32; judges, Ex. 22, 8 (in Hebrew text v. 7: "the master of the house shall be brought unto *elohim*"); Ps. 82, 1, 6; John 10, 34; people of influence, Ps. 89, 7, and the holy angels, Ps. 97, 7 (comp. Hebr. 1, 6), are given the divine names *elohim* and *el*. Evidently this is done by a figure of speech. Scripture recognizes the fact that divine titles may be applied when the divine nature is wanting, Gal. 4, 8. Accordingly, when God claims the divine name for Himself alone, the term "name" is used as the exponent of the divine essence. He alone is all-wise, almighty, good, etc. Absolute goodness can be predicated of one Being only, that is God, Matt. 19, 17; Mark 10, 18; Luke 18, 19. Luther's rendering in these three passages, "der einige Gott," is preferable to the literal rendering of the Authorized Version, because it expresses the mind of Christ more strikingly. Likewise in its religious relations mankind is restricted to one divine Being only; there is "one Lawgiver," James 4, 12; belief in the existence of one God is approved, James 2, 19. Christ mediated between mankind and one God, Gal. 3, 20. One God justifies Jew and Gentile, Rom. 3, 30. And so Paul teaches Christians: "There is none other God but one (*εἰ μὴ εἷς*). For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many and lords many), but to us there is but one God" (*εἷς θεός*), 1 Cor. 8, 4—6.

For his own sake, not for use in the class-room, the catechist may note furthermore, that this text teaches also the *plurality of persons* in the One Godhead. "The Lord *Eloheinu* is one Lord." *Eloheinu* is the plural. In the same breath God declares Himself to be several and one.

"On this verse the Jews lay great stress; it is one of the four passages which they write on their phylacteries, and they write the last letter in the first and last words very large, for

the purpose of exciting attention to the weighty truth it contains. It is perhaps in reference to this custom of the Jews that our blessed Lord alludes, Matt. 22, 38; Mark 12, 29. 30, where He says, *This is the first and great commandment. . . .* When this passage occurs in the Sabbath readings in the synagogue, the whole congregation repeat the last word *achad* (one) for several minutes together with the loudest vociferations: this, I suppose, they do to vent a little of their spleen against the Christians, for they suppose the latter hold three Gods, because of their doctrine of the Trinity. . . . Were the Christians, when reading this verse, to vociferate *Eloheinu* for several minutes as the Jews do *achad*, it would apply more forcibly in the way of conviction to the Jews of the *plurality* of the persons in the Godhead, than the word *achad*, of *one*, against any pretended false tenet of Christianity, as every Christian receives the doctrine of the *unity* of God in the most conscientious manner." (Clarke, *ibid.*)

Matt. 28, 19: *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

Three appellatives are here introduced, but these three are *one* name (*εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, not *τὰ ὀνόματα*). In a different view Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three names. One person of the Godhead calls the other by the name here given, Ps. 2, 7; John 17, 1; Luke 23, 46; John 15, 26. But the three names here given are backed by one authority, one almighty power, one grace and love, all of which virtues are required for the institution of a sacrament and its maintenance and abiding obligation upon men. (NB. This is not the place to show that *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* means *into* the name; that is a matter that should be reserved when this text occurs again as the baptismal command; see Qu. 277.) This text, then, teaches that there are *three* persons in the Godhead, not more nor less, and that these three share the name, dignity, power, etc., of God equally. Hence, there is a Trinity in Unity. God is three in one, triune.

“Baptism is not made in the name of a quality or attribute of the Divine nature. The orthodox, as they are termed, have generally considered this text as a decisive proof of the doctrine of the holy Trinity: and what else can they draw from it? Is it possible for words to convey a plainer sense than these do? And do they not direct every reader to consider the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as three distinct persons? ‘But this I can never believe.’ I cannot help that—you shall not be persecuted by me for differing from my opinion. I cannot go over to *you*; I must abide by what I believe to be the meaning of the Scriptures.” (Clarke *ad loc.*)

2 Cor. 13, 14: *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.*

Numb. 6, 24—26: *The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: the Lord make His face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.*

The preceding passage showed that there are in the Godhead three persons united in One Being. These two passages name and refer to the same persons, but show that they are distinct from each other. This was indicated also in the passage from Matthew by the definite article which is affixed to each person there named. The article expresses individuality, marks the person as distinct. But in these two passages the distinction is made stronger, because each person is represented as holding to us a peculiar relation. We are taught to view God the Father as the One who loves us. He so loved us that He sent His Son to redeem us, John 3, 16. He blesses us and keeps us. We are taught to view Christ as the God who is gracious to sinners. In Him the grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Tit. 2, 11. He makes His face shine upon us; He does not look at us with a sour, surly, wry face, but with a face beaming with tender affection, radiant with smiles, as a father looks upon his child. And we are taught

to view the Holy Ghost as the God who brings us into communion with the Father and the Son by giving us peace with God. Thus these passages express to the mind what was exhibited to the senses at the Lord's baptism in Jordan, Matt. 3, 16. 17.

The three persons of the Trinity are really persons, not attributes, energies, modes of manifestation, etc., of the One Supreme Being. Each person not only exists together with, but also distinct from, the other. The revelation which John witnessed at the baptism of Jesus "forcibly marks divine personality." (Clarke ad Matt. 3, 16. 17.) As the Son was incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, so the Spirit became visible also in a bodily shape, Luke 3, 22, like a dove, while the Father is distinct from both by the voice from heaven. Neither person in that moment was engaged in the same act as the other. Though by the unity of essence each cooperated, unseen by man's eyes, in the action of the other, yet each was engaged in a distinct act, as each also exhibited Himself in a different place from the other.

In conclusion, we note that the doctrine that there are three distinct Persons in one divine essence, is very old. We derive arguments for it from *both* Testaments. Adam, Moses, David, Isaiah, knew the true God to be triune, as well as did Peter, Paul, Luther, and any Christian child in our day. The Scriptures of the New Testament shed greater light on this truth, as they do on other truths, but the doctrine of the Trinity is recorded with sufficient distinctness on the very first page of the Bible. "God created," "the Spirit moved upon the face of the waters," "God said" (Gen. 1, 1—3), *i. e.*, God spoke into being through His Word, who was with Him in the beginning and was God (John 1, 1—3) — thus God, from the beginning, has declared Himself to be One and Three. When Aaron and his successors were commanded to bless the children of Israel, a stated form for doing this was given them. Thrice they had to invoke the name of God in their blessing, and God Himself calls this act "putting His name upon the children of Israel,"

Numb. 6, 27. This act of blessing the people was considered an important priestly function as it is mentioned on a line with other functions, Lev. 9, 22; 1 Chron. 23, 13. Isaiah was made to hear the seraphims sing their "Thrice Holy." Thus God was at pains to have His people constantly put in mind that the God who is truly One is this God who is Three in One.

Ps. 2, 7: *Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee.*

We had ascertained that the three persons of the Godhead are distinct each from the other. The distinctness of each is declared not only to us, but also within the circle of the Holy Trinity itself. It flows from certain acts which cause us to predicate something of one person that we cannot predicate of the other. Each person has a personal attribute which never passes over to either of the other persons, and thus fixes its distinctness forever. In Ps. 2, 7 we behold this difference in full operation as between the Father and the Son. The brief statement is in the form of an address: there is a party speaking and a party spoken to. I and Thou, my and Thee, as every child knows, refer to the first and second person. The relation of speaker and addressee is accidental. The speaker on one occasion may be the addressee on another. Thus we find the addressee in this text the speaker in John 17. However, the subject of the brief discourse between speaker and addressee in the text before us never changes hands, so to speak, between them. The speaker here states with regard to Himself: "I have begotten Thee," and with regard to the party spoken to: "Thou art my Son." He claims for Himself fatherhood, for the party spoken to sonship. This relation is never inverted between the first and second persons of the Godhead. True, Christ is also called Father, Is. 9, 6. A person may hold to one the relation of son, while to another he holds the relation of father. Christ is "the everlasting Father," or the eternity-Father, from whom eternity takes its origin (if we can speak of an origin of eternity!). He is the father of the raindrop, Job 38, 28, the "Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turn-

ing," James 1, 17. He has created us and acts as a father to us. But He is not the father of the Father. This statement: "To-day I have begotten Thee," cannot be made by any other than the first person of the Trinity. And this statement: "Thou art my Son," based on the ground here stated, cannot refer to any other than the second person of the Trinity. Angels are called "the sons of God," Job 1, 6; 2, 1; 38, 7; also all men, Mal. 2, 10, especially those who walk in His ways, Gen. 6, 2. 4. But Christ alone is the Son of God, because "He hath begotten Him;" He is "the only Begotten of the Father," John 1, 14. 18; 3, 16. 18; 1 John 4, 9. In an inscrutable and ineffable manner God has communicated His essence to His Son, who thus is "the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person," Hebr. 1, 3. He is "the Firstbegotten," Hebr. 1, 6, "the image of the invisible God, the Firstborn of every creature," Col. 1, 15. Luther rightly renders the genitive *πάσης κτίσεως* by "vor" (*prae*, not *ante*) "allen Creaturen." The Son's origin not only antecedes by the difference of eternity, but also excels by the difference of divine majesty that of every creature. He has taken His being directly from God and shares all God's attributes, being "one with the Father," John 10, 30. He addresses the first person of the Godhead as His Father, and the Father proclaims Him as His beloved Son. This relation constitutes the personal attribute of the Father and Son.

John 15, 26: *When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me.*

Gal. 4, 6: *Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.*

These passages state the personal attribute of the Holy Spirit. Christ speaks of Him as "another," John 14, 16, distinct from Himself and from the Father. He goes out from the Father (*ἐκπορεύεται*). Christ also is gone out from the Father (*ἐξέρχεται*), John 8, 42; 16, 27 ff.; 17, 8. The choice

of these two verbs, the former of which is always applied to the procession of the Spirit, while the latter is used to describe the advent of Christ into the world, shows that each is a different action. Virtually Christ, in John 15, 26, predicates of the Spirit both ἐξέρχεσθαι and ἐκπορεύεσθαι, the former as an action to be expected by the disciples, the latter as an action which is already going on, the former as an official act of the Spirit, the latter as an action by which the Spirit is constituted in His essence and being. He is "the Spirit of God," τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor. 2, 11), *i. e.*, as the next verse declares, "the Spirit which is of God," τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. The mode of this procession passes our comprehension. The allusion to breath issuing from the mouth (Ps. 33, 6; John 20, 22), to the wind (John 3, 8), is helpful, but inadequate to express this act.

The procession is not from the Father alone, but also from the Son, but this latter fact is not as explicitly stated as the former. Still the genitive in Gal. 4, 6, whether it is understood as expressing ownership or origin, sufficiently indicates the procession also from the Son. Christ also speaks and acts in a manner indicating this procession, John 20, 22; 15, 26; 16, 7.

The reading of the Athanasian Creed, especially to applicants for confirmation, would serve the purpose of a resumé or review of this doctrine.

(To be continued.)

DR. MARTIN LUTHER'S TREATISE OF CONFESSION, WHETHER THE POPE HAVE POWER TO ENJOIN SAME.

JESUS.

1. First. The holy king and prophet David has composed a psalm of 176 verses, by far the longest and largest psalm of all, which in its four divisions is daily sung and read in the churches, at prime, tierce, sext, and none. And it is especially strange that each verse from beginning to end prays for nearly

the same thing and has the same content as the other, so that it is tedious, — unless the Spirit guide us, — to hear that in so long a psalm one and the same matter is treated, though in different words, so many times, namely, one hundred and seventy-six times. For the scope of all the verses and of the entire psalm comprises two things: First, that God would guide and teach, instruct and keep us in His ways, commandments, and laws; secondly, that He would keep us from human doctrines and ordinances. Whosoever attends to these two things easily understands every verse and the entire psalm.

2. Second. We ask, Why has the prophet done this? The answer is self-evident, viz.: to give us an earnest warning which we might have before our eyes daily, to beware of, and flee from, human doctrines and laws as from the greatest misfortune on this earth, for nothing glitters more beautifully and does greater harm. Thus Christ, Matt. 7, 15, when He had proclaimed His teaching, concludes with a warning to beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. And He earnestly admonishes the disciples, Matt. 16, 6. 12, to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, that is, as He Himself explains, to beware of human doctrines that teach merely hypocrisy and not foundation truths.

3. Here David has done the same, as if to say: Now, then, I will compose a psalm that contains nothing but a warning of human doctrines, and I will heap the measure even unto surfeit, for I see that they glitter so beautifully, are swallowed so easily, and seduce us from God's laws so craftily and covertly. Accordingly, there has been a good reason for reading this psalm above others daily, although it has been of no avail. Christendom has become filled, nevertheless, with human laws, and even this psalm, contrary to its own intent, has been tied down with human laws. All the priests read it every day, not knowing in the least what they read.

4. Third. Although this psalm ought to be sufficient to give us a horror of commandments of men, the disease has gone

so deep and so far that all men have been brought to believe firmly in a false interpretation, everybody holding that the sayings in this psalm, and similar ones, are directed only against public and great transgressions, and not against the laws of the pope and the priests. Thus they have not only dulled the edge of the sword, but they have placed a piece of horn over it so that it cannot cut, so much so that the laws of the pope, and not Holy Scripture, now rule everywhere. Therefore it is necessary to fight and storm against such old and deeply rooted errors with mighty and trenchant verses of Holy Scripture. Let us see whether we can drive them from the field and reveal their unwarranted procedure and unjust tyranny, so that we may again teach and know that whatsoever God has not commanded is to be avoided as the devil's poison and death, no matter whether the pope or the bishops, whether angels or devils have ordained it.

5. Fourth. In the first place, Moses says Deut. 4, 2 [ch. 12, 23]: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it." Can "to add to" mean anything else than to teach more, and to "diminish from" to teach less than is taught by Scripture? It cannot refer to interpretation, for interpretation neither increases nor diminishes, but merely explains. Is not this a plain passage against all man-made laws? Now what are the pope's laws other than additions pure and simple, on account of which Scripture gives a special name to the devil and calls him in Hebrew "Leviathan," that is, "increaser," one who increases a thing beyond its due limits.

6. Therefore all that add man-made laws to God's laws are surely God's enemies and apostles of Leviathan, and whosoever accepts and keeps these laws is a disciple of Leviathan. It is no excuse to say that Moses has said this not in regard to the New but to the Old Testament; for the apostle says Hebr. 2, 2—4 that we ought to give more earnest heed to the New Testament, given through Christ Himself, than the Old, which

He has given through angels. Thus the popish sect cannot stand before this verse; their laws lie in the dust.

7. Fifth. Similarly, Solomon says, Prov. 30, 5. 6: "Every word of God is pure," tested as by fire; "He is a shield unto them that put their trust in Him. Add thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee and thou be found a liar." Behold, he speaks of "every word of God," not only of the Old Testament, and denounces all those as culpable and as liars that add anything to it. It must follow, that whosoever puts his trust in human laws and additions trusts in lies and deceptions. Thus the pope is nothing but a teacher of lies and deceiver of all the world, he and all his fellows.

8. This is the origin of the proverb in the prophet Isaiah [ch. 36, 6] and in the Book of Kings [2 Kings 18, 21]: "If a man lean upon a staff of reed, it will break and pierce his hand," that is, if one trust in human teachings that appear to be good and proper; just as a reed closely resembles a solid staff of wood, and yet is worthless and hollow: at last it breaks, and the hand, that is, all the works done by it, is ruined and made a source of weakness. This is the reed which the Jews put into the hands of Christ when they mocked Him, Matt. 27, 29, foreshadowing the future deception of the pope's doctrines and laws.

9. Sixth. In the same manner Isaiah reproves the nation as follows (ch. 1, 22): "Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water." To pour water into wine is to add the commandments of men to God's Word; likewise, to sell dross for silver. The pope is such a thieving merchant selling polluted water for good wine. But I must refrain from using such figurative sayings, although they are attractive and the Scriptures are full of them. For our quarrelsome enemies might evade them, saying: Wine and silver does not signify divine Scripture, or at least not expressly and clearly, and in a controversy we ought to fight with plain passages of Scripture. The children of Israel have set us an example, for in Joshua

(ch. 8, 24; 10, 28) we read that they slew the enemies "with the 'mouth' of the sword,"¹⁾ that is, with the sharp edge where-with it bites and devours, a thing it cannot do with the back or sides. The mouth of the sword is its edge. Thus one must wield the Word of God with the naked edge so that it may mightily devour all opponents and all errors.

10. Seventh. Jeremiah has written an entire chapter on the false prophets (Jer. 23); among other things he says (v. 16): "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Harken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you: they make you vain: they speak a vision of their own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord." Behold, all prophets that speak not out of the mouth of God, deceive, and God forbids us to hearken unto them. Does not this passage plainly say that where God's Word is not preached no one, as he fears God's command and anger, is to listen, and that it is mere deception?

11. O pope, O bishops, O priests, O monks, O theologians, how can you pass in view of this text? Do you deem it a small thing when the high Majesty forbids whatever does not come out of the mouth of God and is something other than God's Word? This was not spoken on the threshing-floor or by a shepherd. If you heard your master say to you: Who has commanded you this? I have not commanded you to do this; I think you would gather this much from his words, that you ought not to have done it and have avoided it as forbidden. What, then, shall we do when the high Majesty says: Do not hearken, it is not my word; are we not in fairness bound to defy the pope in all his mad laws of which he himself must confess that they are only words out of his own heart, not God's words issued from the mouth of God?

12. Eighth. But he continues in the same chapter (v. 21): "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied." I think it is proper enough to demand that no one is to preach anything but God's

1) Original Hebrew.

Word, and when Divine Majesty says: I have not commanded it, it is sufficient to indicate that it is not God's Word. Therefore all commandments of men are surely lies, deception, and perdition.

13. To proceed (v. 22): "But if they had stood in my counsel, and had caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings." Do you not hear again that we must cause the people to hear God's counsel and God's words, and that otherwise no one can be converted from a bad to a good life? God's Word must do it, not the word of men. What need would there be of God's Word, if human doctrines could help us? Moreover, what sort of a God would He be, if His Word did not suffice and needed the additions of men? Ought we not in justice to divide the honor and thanks, giving them not only to God, but also to those that add thereto? But God's Word is so sensitive that it cannot bear any addition; it must be pure, or nothing at all. God can bear that something impure, something that has been added by men, should insinuate itself into our actions and life, but in His Word, which is to cleanse us from all additions and impurities, He cannot tolerate any additions; otherwise our life would not become pure in all eternity. Therefore He calls it (Ps. 12, 7) a silver that is pure, and says: "The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." This He applies in the same psalm against those who add human doctrines.

14. Ninth. Later on [vv. 28. 29] He says: "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my Word, let him speak my Word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my Word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Behold, human doctrine is "chaff," God's Word is "fire." How well they agree together! And whosoever has God's Word must preach it aright, and not pervert it according to human notions. If anyone have a dream, that is, a revelation in his sleep, let him regard it as such, and not pretend it

to be anything else. For Numb. 12, 6. 8 God declares that He reveals His Word in a threefold manner, in a dream, in a vision, and publicly in the Spirit. And to conclude the quotation from Jeremiah, God continues [vv. 30—32]: “Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words everyone from his neighbor” (that is, by the glittering commandments of men they hide the Word of God, so that the people do not see how they are deprived of God’s Word, and accept man’s words for God’s Word). “Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say, He saith. Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their lightness; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them; therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord.”

15. Tenth. If we are not moved by such words in which God Himself so fully tells us that whatsoever is not His Word is void, we are surely of stone and wood. If He had simply said that they should not teach such things, and if He had not added that they are not His command and His Word, someone might find a loophole and say: That does not reject everything which is not God’s Word, but merely that which is evil and contrary to God’s Word. Thus they could devise something intermediate between God’s Word and false prophets, as they have done ere this. But this intermediate thing has been done away with, and it has been firmly established that God’s Word alone, and not human doctrine, is to rule among God’s people. For whatever He has not enjoined, advised, or commanded no one is to command or require.

16. Eleventh. Let us proceed to the New Testament and hear first what He Himself says concerning this matter. Matt. 15, 7—9 Christ says to the Jews that kept their commandments of men and reproved His disciples for not keeping them: “Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips: but their heart is far from me. But in

vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Tell me, What is "to serve God in vain"? Does this text need a gloss? And yet there was no evil in the commandments of those men, such as the washing of hands and clothes and the cleansing of pots and other vessels; why, then, does Christ, as well as Esaias, reject them so utterly? What plea can be brought forth here to save the commandments of men? Who would serve a hangman in vain, let alone God? Who would willingly render vain service?

17. I think Christ has here sufficiently indicated that He would have the commandments of men forbidden. He Himself acted contrary to them; He commanded and permitted His disciples to act contrary to them; He taught and preached against them. He certainly would not have done this and would surely have set us a different example, if God did not reject and forbid man-made doctrines, since Christ was obedient to God in all things. Therefore we must follow His example in all things, and without doubt also in despising man-made ordinances, if we would be true Christians.

18. Twelfth. St. Paul (Rom. 16, 17. 18) says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary" (Greek: *παρά*; Vulgate: *praeter*; German: *neben*) "to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." He speaks not of doctrines which are set up in opposition to, but by the side of, true doctrine. These are the additions that produce divisions and may easily offend the simple, so that they miss the right way and cling to the additions. Of this Solomon writes (Prov. 4, 24—27): "Put away from thee a froward mouth, and perverse lips put far from thee. Let thine eyes look right on, and let thine eyelids look straight before thee. Ponder the path of thy feet, and let all thy ways be established. Turn not to the right hand nor to the left, remove thy foot from evil." Why, do you think, does Solomon at such length express his desire to keep us in

the undeviating path? Is it not because God's Word and way alone ought to be before our eyes, without any byway whatsoever, whether to the right or to the left, whether good or bad? Now, human doctrines are surely mere byways and not God's highway.

19. Thirteenth. Similarly, St. Peter says (2 Pet. 2, 1. 2): "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon them swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways." Behold, he also speaks of byways and sects; this cannot be aught else than human doctrine, extraneous to God's doctrine and ways; and the more beautifully they glitter the worse they are.

20. On this point Solomon has written two parables in the 7th and 8th chapters of Proverbs. Here he earnestly warns us against the harlot that uses sweet words and deserts the master of her youth, and forgets the covenant she made with her God. All this is said with regard to the last times when the devil's church with human doctrines deceives the Church of God. And Solomon describes her as follows (Prov. 9, 13—18): "A foolish woman is clamorous; she is simple, and knoweth nothing. For she sitteth at the door of her house, on a seat in the high places of the city, to call passengers who go right on their ways: Whoso is simple, let him turn hither: and as for him that wanteth understanding, she saith to him, Stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant. But he knoweth not that the dead are there, and that her guests are in the depths of hell."

21. O pope, how well thou, together with thy church, hast been portrayed in this parable! Who sits in a high place in Christendom? Who sits at the door on the street? Who else but our formalists with their external visible holiness? Who entices those that walk aright unto himself into the murderers' den and depth of hell? Who is more loquacious and unlearned

in God's ways than this mad crowd of hypocrites? Who seduces the simple and those that lack understanding? What are the stolen waters and the bread eaten in secret other than this, that one pretending to have divine truth fill the simple with human doctrine? It is a parable and cannot be said of a real human harlot.

22. Fourteenth. Similarly, Prov. 7, 4—27 he says of the same devil's harlot: "My son, say unto wisdom, Thou art my sister; and call understanding thy kinswoman: that they may keep thee from the strange woman, from the stranger which flattereth with her words. For at the window of my house I looked through my casement, and beheld among the simple ones, I discerned among the youths, a young man void of understanding, passing through the street near her corner; and he went the way to her house, in the twilight, in the evening, in the black and dark night: and, behold, there met him a woman with the attire of an harlot, and subtil of heart. (She is loud and stubborn; her feet abide not in her house: now is she without, now in the streets, and lieth in wait at every corner.) So she caught him, and kissed him, and with an impudent face said unto him, I have peace offerings with me; this day have I payed my vows. Therefore came I forth to meet thee, diligently to seek thy face, and I have found thee. I have decked my bed with coverings of tapestry, with carved works, with fine linen of Egypt. I have perfumed my bed with myrrh, aloes, and cinnamon. Come, let us take our fill of love until the morning: let us solace ourselves with loves. For the good-man is not at home, he is gone a long journey: he hath taken a bag of money with him, and will come home at the day appointed. With her much fair speech she caused him to yield, with the flattering of her lips she forced him. He goeth after her straightway, as an ox goeth to the slaughter, or as a fool to the correction of the stocks; till a dart strike through his liver; as a bird hasteth to the snare, and knoweth not that it is for his life. Hearken unto me now therefore, O ye children, and attend to the words of my mouth. Let not thine heart decline

to her ways, go not astray in her paths. For she hath cast down many wounded: yea, many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death."

23. Fifteenth. This certainly is speaking in parables. And although it might be understood as depicting a real woman, still the true interpretation is to take it as directed against human doctrines inasmuch as Solomon himself says that he speaks exclusively in parables and allegories. Christ does likewise in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, ch. 13, 34. 35. He plainly foresaw that in the eventide of the world, when the sun of faith shall have set and when a mad people devoid of understanding shall follow their vagaries on earth in external ways and specious holiness, this would be a people meet for this harlot called human wisdom and doctrine. She highly praises and adorns herself, promises much and makes the way unto salvation easy, as we see it done before our eyes in the church of the pope, which tallies to every word of this description. But to follow out this interpretation would take too long; enough has been said for the wise, and we must now fight with clear texts of Scripture, as was said above.

24. Sixteenth. St. Paul says twice (Gal. 1, 8. 9): "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which ye have received, let him be accursed." That is certainly a hard saying of the apostle. Now human doctrine is undoubtedly something else than the Gospel, and must, therefore, surely be accursed. But let us see, they have made a loophole in this passage, with a gloss that reads as follows: The words "any other gospel" do not mean here that we are not to teach or observe anything beside the Gospel, but that we ought not to contradict or deny the Gospel, and this the pope with his laws is not doing. Now listen, are they not fine glossarists? If I now asked them what ground they have for this gloss, and who gives them power thus to wrest the words of the apostle, they will say as we may read of them in the twelfth Psalm (v. 5): We have the power, why dost thou ask?

And as the pope with puffed cheeks blusters and sputters in his decretal: "*Ubi est majoritas, ibi est mandandi auctoritas, caeteris manet obediendi necessitas.*" Because we are in the majority, we have power to command; all others are bound to obey. I ween that sounds apostolic and Christian!

25. Seventeenth. But this gloss is easily refuted; in the first place, it is their own fabrication, without any foundation in Scripture. For they can cite no example in which these words have this meaning. In the second place, it is clear that St. Paul does not argue against those who contradicted or denied the Gospel, as they falsely represent, but against some disciples of the other apostles who desired to inculcate the law of Moses beside the Gospel. For he says more than once that they should not obey those who would introduce circumcision, holidays, and other laws of Moses in addition to the Gospel. Observe now, if St. Paul could not suffer the law of Moses given by God till the time of Christ to be preached, in addition to the Word of God and His Gospel, and if he so earnestly cursed himself and all angels from heaven if they taught any addition: what would he say in regard to the ordinances of the pope and other men which God has never commanded?

26. Therefore, this saying of Paul is truly a thunder-clap that drives the pope with all his doctrinal dreams and mad commandments as dust into the ground. No one can stand up against this verse. St. Paul was not so ineloquent or so poor in words, he would have been able to say: If anyone contradict or deny the Gospel, let him be accursed, if that had been what he meant in saying "any other gospel." For 1 Tim. 1, 3. 4 he speaks similarly and says: "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine, neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies." Here we see again that the apostle is not concerned about a denial of the Gospel, but about other, additional doctrines and teachings, which secretly turn the people away from the Gospel ere they are aware of it.

27. Eighteenth. Even more clearly he speaks Col. 2, 8: "Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Could anything be clearer? He plainly says: Whatsoever is not after Christ, that is, after Christ's Word and doctrine, is deceit and must be avoided. He expressly names all natural knowledge and wisdom (philosophy), all human doctrine; what more could he name? What does he suffer to remain, save Christ alone? As philosophy is surely the greatest thing man can have, so human laws are the most spiritual thing they can have. But it is all error and deceit, says St. Paul.

28. Nineteenth. In order that we may not carry this matter to an undue length, he gives to the commandments of men a severe blow, Tit. 1, 13, 14, and commands him thus: "Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men, that turn from the truth." What an honor for human ordinances, to say that they merely lead and turn men away from the truth! From this we can easily gather what the apostle St. Paul thinks of the pope and as whose vice-regent he regards him. He regards him as the vice-regent of Lucifer in hell who is the father of all lies (John 8, 44), and as his apostle exalted in Rome, in order to seduce and corrupt all Christendom under the name of Christ as is now the case. Here the proverb is appropriate: Where God builds a church the devil erects a chapel by its side; and where a church is dedicated, there a tavern and fair is bound to be. Thus in the Old Testament he has at all times erected foreign altars and places of worship besides the temple and raised false prophets for them, and in the New Testament he has introduced, besides the holy Gospel, the doctrine of the pope and his sect, until now he alone preaches everywhere and the Gospel lies under the seat.

29. Twentieth. But what if they hold up before us the church councils in which many things have been commanded that are not found in Scripture? Answer: In some councils

articles of faith have been explained by Scripture, for instance, in the Nicene, and some things have been ordained that were drawn from Scripture and founded in Scripture; to observe them is the same as observing the Word of God. But whatever human things have been ordained therein (and the majority or, rather, almost all are of this class) are not observed even by those who praise the councils so highly. They often disagree, one commanding what the other condemns, and the decrees of the councils have become so involved and numerous that they now ordain nothing out of Scripture, but merely out of their own heads, in a great and impious presumption that the Holy Spirit is with them and will not suffer them to err; therefore without fear, without reverence, without understanding they do what they please in the councils, and have corrupted their faith. And if we were to keep and know the laws of all councils, it would be necessary to send more printers into the world and to obtain for men a longer life. Even as it is, a great ocean of such statutes has been collected in course of time; but because it was human trash, it has disappeared in course of time, with the exception of those parts that support the holy Roman chair. These alone have been graven in adamant and preserved a thousand times more carefully than the Gospel of Christ. In what spirit this is done anyone can easily see.

30. Twenty-first. Therefore councils or no councils, if their statutes are commandments of men, they have no value, for they are not councils, but taverns and Jewish synagogues. I believe Christ, nay, even His apostle St. Paul more than all councils, though they be as numerous as the grains of sand in the sea and the stars in the heavens; and he calls down a curse upon himself and all angels if they preach anything except God's Word. Councils must deal with Scripture or with an undoubted indication of the Holy Spirit, as did the first council of the apostles, Acts 15, 6 sqq. It will be a long time before they prove that a council have the Holy Spirit and that they sit as representatives of all Christendom, as they drivel and pretend, unless they deal with Scripture and God's Word. They

will not be believed offhand on account of their boasting and their own testimony. Self-glorification stinks, says Solomon. (Prov. 27, 24.)

31. And, if it must be said, one of the greatest misfortunes in the Christian Church is the shameful, damnable notion that the councils are regarded as having the Holy Spirit, though scarcely one of twenty uses Scripture and shows the guidance of the Spirit. They saw that the first councils, proceeding in the Spirit, have obtained authority, and now they have obtruded themselves into the same honor, regardless of the fact that they, in their life and spirit, may differ by a thousand miles from the first holy fathers in their councils. And as they preach their own lies under God's name and under a pretense of divine truth, so they give to our poor souls under the name and title of holy councils the brood of their synagogues and taverns. In short, when we come to the market with the common people we must pay for pepper and eat the droppings of mice.

32. Twenty-second. If it required no more to form a council than a gathering of many men wearing cardinals' hats and bishops' infulae and barrets, one might gather the wooden saints of the churches and place on their heads cardinals' hats and bishops' infulae and barrets and call it a council. Henceforth there would be no need of the Holy Spirit or of the Gospel in councils; any painter or sculptor could make a council. Are these unlearned, unspiritual cardinals, bishops, and doctors more than wooden blocks? They treat us to a carnival play with their hats and tonsure and caps, so that we might regard them as that which they had rather not be; and yet they have their garments, their gestures, and their position, and frighten us with the saying of Christ (Luke 10, 16): "He that heareth you heareth me;" just as if Christ had commanded them to say what they please. But He says thus (Matt. 28, 20): "Go ye and teach them all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" surely not whatsoever they might fabricate.

33. But someone might say (and this accusation has been raised against me): If there is to be no human law, we cannot

have civil government; would you destroy all authority? I answer: How does this concern civil government? We know well enough that Paul and Peter have commanded us to respect civil authority and laws, Rom. 13, 1; Tit. 3, 1; 1 Pet. 2, 13. But the civil powers do not presume to govern the consciences; they deal only with temporal possessions. A stone-mason must have a law prohibiting him from taking the length of an ell as half an ell; a cobbler, a law not to make shoes of men's size for a child; and even murderers must have a law for an equal division of the booty. In what respect do such laws concern the spirit and conscience? Thus civil government has a law that no one is to harm his neighbor in his property, honor, and body, but it does not claim that thereby our conscience is well ordered before God. But the pope and his spiritual lawgivers fly with Lucifer higher than the heavens, pretending that their laws are divine, that they make us blameless before God, and govern and lead the consciences aright. This thing God cannot endure; here He is jealous. For in our consciences He *will* be alone and have His Word to govern alone; here must be freedom from all commandments of men. If, now, the pope, as the emperor does, would let the consciences alone and would extend his penalties no farther than the emperor, there would be no complaint. But he insists on holding the consciences captive, and asserts that his word is equal to God's Word, and falsely attaches eternal punishment and eternal reward to his laws, a thing no emperor does. Therefore he is the Antichrist that exalts himself above God (2 Thess. 2, 4), and breaks into the bridal chamber of Christ, and makes strumpets of the souls of all Christians.

34. O thou, greatest of all procurers, how far does thy malice and wickedness surpass all words, all thoughts, all understanding! Who can count the consciences which he thus leads astray and strangles and defiles with his laws in all the world. This St. Paul [2 Thess. 2, 9] speaks of as the final and proper working of Satan, the highest and worst devil.

35. Let this suffice as to commandments of men; I hope it has been established firmly enough with passages of Scripture that they are to be shunned as the greatest misfortune on earth. Now let us continue and come to the subject matter for which this preface has been written, namely, secret confession of which all the world complains and justly complains. Let us see, first, whether it be ordained by God or by man, and then instruct ourselves properly. Many have in times past concerned themselves with this question, and the pope would have derived an enormous amount of money if that fair based on human law had been opened. And yet the evil spirit had in view something else that concerned him more than the pope's avarice, otherwise he would have stirred it up long ago.

Fort Wayne, Ind.

W. H. KRUSE.

(To be continued.)

WARTBURG LETTERS OF LUTHER.

(Continued.)

There are four letters extant from the month of June. The first is addressed

TO FRANCIS VON SICKINGEN.¹⁾

Dr. Martin Luther to august and brave Francis von Sickingen, my particular lord and patron:

Grace from God and peace in Christ, our Lord! We read, my lord, in the Book of Joshua that, when God brought the people of Israel into the promised land of Canaan and slew all people therein, namely, one hundred and thirty-one

1) This letter was forwarded together with Luther's treatise "Of Confession, whether the Pope Have Authority to Enjoin Same." It is found in Luther's Works, Wittenb. Ed. VII, 258; Jena Ed. I, 501; Altenb. Ed. I, 783; Leips. Ed. XVII, 692; Erlang. Ed. 27, 318. St. Louis Ed. XIX, 814; also in De Wette II, 13.

kings with all their towns, there was no city so humble as to sue for peace, save Gibeon only,—although Israel had received command from God to offer and to accept peace,—but all were hardened in insolence to make war upon Israel. Hence, the same book speaks of them, ch. 11, 19. 20, as follows: “There was not a city that made peace with the children of Israel, save the Hivites, the inhabitants of Gibeon: all other they took in battle. For it was of the Lord to harden their hearts, that they should come against Israel in battle, that he might destroy them utterly, and that they might have no favor,” etc.

This story, it seems to me, promises to become an example to our popes, bishops, doctors, and other spiritual tyrants, who plainly see and grasp that people are renouncing and tiring of their pretensions, and that everywhere the clear light is revealing in many ways their deceptive and enticing offenses, so that every cover is becoming too short and narrow for them. Still they are not humbled, do not sue for peace, yea, suffer it to be offered them in vain, are emboldened and undertake to quench the light by force and to maintain themselves in power, imagining that they are holding their saddles so firmly that they could not be unhorsed. And I am afraid that this is sent them by God, that, being hardened, they give no thought to humility and do not seek peace, and so they shall have to perish in the end, without mercy.

They are blaming me, although they well know how, in their pride, they have hitherto despised a poor man like me. I have often offered them peace; I have cried and run, have offered to make reply, have debated with them, and have now appeared at two diets. It has all been of no avail to me. I did not meet with justice, but with nefarious practices and violence. They have done no more than to order me to recant and have threatened me with every misfortune.

Well, when the hour shall come for them to cry in vain for peace, I hope that they will remember what they are now earning for themselves. I can do no more; I have now been

pushed from the stage. They have an opportunity now for mending what people cannot, shall not, and will not tolerate of them. If they do not make the change, Another will make it without their thanks, and He will not, like Luther, teach them by letters and words but by deeds. Praise and thanks be to God, because fear and awe of the scarecrow at Rome has at last decreased, and the chapter *Si quis suadente*²⁾ no longer works a spell on people. Men can now pronounce that sort of a blessing themselves.

However, lest I be idle in this wilderness of my Patmos I have also written my Apocalypse,³⁾ which I shall communicate to all who wish to hear it, and which I herewith transmit to your august lordship, in order thereby to show my cordial affection and gratitude for your manifold comfortings and services rendered to my unworthiness. It is a sermon on confession, which I wrote for this reason: During Lent this year I issued a gentle instruction to parishioners,⁴⁾ with a request to our spiritual lords and tyrants not to disturb the peace of conscience of simple people on account of my books. At the same time I showed that their tyrannical way of administering confession was unwarranted. But they rush on headstrong, never heeding or considering aught. Well, I have seen bubbles burst ere this, and once upon a time I beheld smoke so vile that it threatened to put out the sun. But the smoke is gone, and the sun is still shining. I shall continue to burnish and to set forth the truth, and my fear of my ungracious lords shall be as small as their contempt of me is great. Neither of us has crossed the mountain yet; however, I have this advantage, that

2) A chapter from the papal decretals outlining the mode of procedure when a person, prompted by the devil (*suadente diabolo*), had laid hands on a priest.

3) Cf. Rev. 1, 9.

4) "Dr. Martin Luther's Instruction for those going to confession, how to act in case the papal clergy refuse to absolve them unless they surrender his books which had been interdicted." This treatise was published during February, 1521, before Luther set out for Worms. See St. Louis Ed. XIX, 808 ff.

I am traveling unencumbered. God grant victory to the truth! Godspeed to you! I commend to your grace Ulrich von Hutten and Martin Bucer.

Given in my Patmos, the first day of June, 1521. —

The next letter was written a week later and addressed

TO JUSTUS JONAS.⁵⁾

Jesus.

To the honorable Dr. Justus Jonas, provost of the collegiate institution at Wittenberg, his superior in the Lord, Martin Luther wishes grace in the Lord.

I, too, should have liked very much to congratulate you heartily, my dear Jonas, upon your recent accession to office;⁶⁾ however, as I could not be present in person, I have resolved to send you herewith my Latomus. But he is no longer a reviler of the knowledge of languages; for this Ishbi-benob has been laid low by the strength of our Abishai (2 Sam. 21, 16. 17); so you can be unconcerned. Nor is he even a tardy advocate trying to justify the crime of these Loewen marauders under the malicious cover of a feigned modesty and of cunning, yet luckless, expressions. For you have seen yourself, I believe, how this person vauntingly places his reliance only on his master, the pope, and his bull. But I send you a Latomus who has been expurgated by Luther's purgative and now appears to have been eased of the sprites and hobgoblins, with which he was formerly driven about himself and was wont to drive pious souls about. If they had offered this "Proof" betimes and had consulted these wise people before acting, as behooved them, they would neither have condemned nor burned

5) This letter is the epistle dedicatory to Luther's reply to Latomus and the University of Loewen. (See THEOL. QUARTERLY, Vol. X, p. 100, note 41.) Luther's reply was published at Wittenberg during August, 1521, and a second edition appeared in the year following. The letter to Jonas is found in Luther's Works, Wittenb. Ed. II, 223; Jena Latin Ed. II, 400; Erlang. Ed. Opera varii argum. V, 397. St. Louis Ed. XVIII, 1057.

6) Jonas had been made professor and provost at Wittenberg in 1521. (See Guericke, *Kirchengesch.* III, 75.)

my books, nor would they have taken counsel, like fools, after acting. So much I hope to have achieved. Latomus teaches me quite sufficiently in this treatise of his how easy it has been for them, in Luther's absence, to prate in their nooks: That is heresy! That is false! If they did not rely on might, they would not have dared to attack these matters openly.

Besides, I am persuaded that Latomus would never have published this glorious "Proof," if the bull had not fanned the fire of his confidence. Relying on it, he brags that his action has been approved, still dreaming of the antiquated and obsolete terror of bulls, and hence, he imagines that he has terrorized the whole world with his treatise, and he dares irreverently, in opposing Luther, to dilly-dally with the awful Scriptures of God. However, I should not like to see such an act go unapproved by such a bull. Nor should I wish, on the other hand, not to have been anathematized by such a bull. Everything harmonizes gloriously: the bull, the cause, the judge, and the advocate. May the Lord Jesus keep me and all pious souls from their contaminating fellowship. Amen.

However, you can hardly believe how reluctantly I have wrested myself from the peaceable writings of Christ on which I have been engaged,⁷⁾ and have wasted time reading the chicaneries of a bristling and thorny sophist. For I had before me a person who was a sophist from head to foot and was, in addition, puffed up on account of this bauble of a bull, and yet wrote with so much confidence that he regarded both painstaking and consideration of his subject as unnecessary. He was content to babble just what he chanced to have read or what came into his mouth. Now, there is not a task more

7) At the close of his "Refutation of Latomus" we find this remark (1198): "However, I revert to you, my dear Jonas, and am sending this Latomus away so as to be rid of an annoyance, because I have now begun my German Exposition of the Gospels and Epistles; that is the reason why reading and replying to his filth has proven an annoyance." In the letter to Melancthon of May 26th there was a similar reference to the work on his *Kirchenpostille*. And that, rather than his translation of the New Testament, is probably what Luther refers to also at this place.

tedious than replying to such people, because, by so doing, one can neither exercise the mind nor advance learning, and is simply forced to squander most precious hours. I surmise that this fellow believed that Luther had been removed or forever silenced, and that they might reoccupy the entire world with the tyranny of their sophistry. They blame me not a little on account of the overthrow and mitigation of their tyranny. Would to God the overthrow had been complete, and I had been able to commit a mortal sin and to contract that perfect guilt which is unpardonable to the seventh degree, if we are to believe the most holy popes who issue the bulls.

I fear, however, that while we are bravely disputing concerning grace and good works we are depriving ourselves both of grace and of works. When I behold these fearful signs of the divine wrath, I for my person have no other desire than that fountains of tears might be given to my head, Jer. 9, 1, in order that I might weep over the extreme destruction of souls which this kingdom of sin and perdition has brought about. The monster at Rome is sitting in the Church and pretends to be God; the bishops are flattering, the sophists are paying homage, and hypocrites are doing all for him. Meanwhile "hell hath enlarged herself and opened her mouth without measure," Is. 5, 14, and Satan is sporting with the destruction of souls. And there is no one among us on this day of wrath to arise, earnestly and with tears, and to make up the hedge for the house of Israel, Ezek. 13, 5. Accordingly, I am filled with indignation against such blasphemous men as Latomus who are practicing sophistry in such serious matters and compel us to lay aside more profitable matters and to be occupied with their raving nonsense, and I imprecate upon their exceedingly hard heads the prayer in Ps. 6, 11: "Let all mine enemies be ashamed and sore vexed: let them return and be ashamed suddenly."

However, lest I detain you with too long a letter, I shall answer the main points in Latomus' preface by another introduction. Accept, for the present, this testimony of my

affection for you and pray the Lord for me that I may also be delivered — for I now make bold to speak thus with the apostle, Rom. 15, 31 — from these evil and unbelieving men at Babel, and that a door may be opened unto me for the praise of the glory of His Son's grace in the Gospel. However, I also pray the Lord to grant you His Holy Spirit to the end that you may lecture on the pestiferous decretals of Antichrist, which you are commissioned to teach, for no other purpose than I told you, viz., that you should go, attired like Aaron in sacred garments, *i. e.*, armed with the words of Holy Writ, and bearing before you the censer of prayer, to meet the destroyer in the midst of this Roman conflagration which has set the whole world on fire, but shall soon be put out by another conflagration from heaven, namely, by the coming of our Savior, for which we are waiting. This, then, is what you ought to do, my dear brother; you must teach your pupils that they must forget what you are teaching, and that they must know that men should flee from all that the pope and the papists ordain and observe, as they would from deadly poison. For since we cannot abolish this public nuisance of the world by force and are compelled to be in charge of these blasphemous offices of Babylon, the only course left open to us is, to discharge them in such a manner as to declare them to be quite foreign to, and destroyers and enemies of insatiable cruelty, hostile to our fatherland, the heavenly Jerusalem, lest we laugh and cast sheep's-eyes at our own bondage with those who are lost and to whom the Gospel of the glory of God is hid, 2 Cor. 4, 3.

Do not regard your office lightly; for after teaching the venomous filth of the pope and his excessively mad nonsense you are to teach the Gospel of Jesus Christ which brings life and salvation, thus furnishing to our youths an antidote against this poison, the very odor of which slays men, until they shall have learned to reject of their own accord what is evil, and to choose what is good. May our Emmanuel be commended to you! Be strong, then, and quit yourself like a man, and be not afraid of this Baal-Peor, for he is hardly a Beelzebub,

that is, a lord of fleas, provided only we believe. For Jesus Christ is the Lord, indeed, to whom be praise for evermore! Amen. May He perfect and strengthen you and His little Church with you. In His name farewell.

Given at my place of sojourn abroad, June 8, 1521.

(To be continued.)

BOOK REVIEW.

LUTHERAN WITNESS TRACT No. 13: *Opinions on Secret Societies*, collected and arranged by Wm. Dallmann. Second edition, revised. American Lutheran Publication Board, 2103-5 S. Sidney St., Pittsburg, Pa. Price per copy, 5 cts.; dozen, 50 cts.; hundred, \$3.50.

This tract contains 125 opinions, 35 of preachers of various denominations, 25 of college presidents, professors, etc., 22 of editors, the remainder of statesmen. The tract is useful chiefly in meeting the charge that the "Missouri Lutherans" are alone in their opposition to secret oathbound societies of a religious character. We should not be afraid to maintain this opposition alone, in the consciousness of a higher Power being allied to our humble testimony; but we are naturally pleased to have company on this ground, and should be still more pleased if the company were still more congenial and agreed with us, especially on the great questions which still divide the Church. — We join the author in his prayer: "May these testimonies confirm us in our stand, keep back those that would enter, and draw out those that are in, such societies."

THE PRECIOUS AND SACRED WRITINGS OF MARTIN LUTHER.

Based on the Kaiser Chronological Edition, with Reference to the Erlangen and Walch Editions. Vol. XI: *Luther's Church Postil*, Gospels for Epiphany, Lent, and Easter Sermons. By Prof. John Nicholas Lenker, D. D. Vol. II. Second Thousand. Lutherans in All Lands Co., Minneapolis, Minn. 1906. 16 and 398 pp.

This volume arrived too late for review in our present issue, and will be discussed in our October issue.